DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 216 TM 007 524

AUTHOR Buttram, Joan L.; Dusewicz, Russell A.
TITLE Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow-Up Study of Ex-Offenders. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 77
NOTE 147p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Adult Basic Education; *Attendance; *Correctional Education; Correctional Rehabilitation; Educational Benefits; Employment; Evaluation Criteria; High School Equivalency Programs; Post Secondary Education; *Prisoners; *Probationary Period; *Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Recidivism; *Rehabilitation Programs; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

A follow-up of ex-offenders five to six months after release from prison was conducted to determine the extent to which those who had participated in educational programs prior to release benefitted differentially with respect to employment and social adjustment, as compared with those who had not participated in such programs. Data were gathered on both a pre- and post-release basis for a large number of variables via institutional records, personal interviews, test administrations and rating forms. One hundred thirty-three inmates were traced after release and interviewed five to six months later to determine their employment status and social adjustment. Participants in educational programs were classified as follows: adult basic education or general educational development (45 persons); vocational education (35); postsecondary education (13); no enrollment (35); and unclassified (5 persons). Among the variables studied were: employment status, employment adjustment, general social adjustment, and absconding/recidivism. Ex-offenders enrolled in post-secondary education programs were found to have violated parole and/or been arrested significantly fewer times than were those in the no-enrollment control group. Except for this finding, no overall consistent pattern of significant differences were observed among any of the groups. Implications are drawn for a re-examination of the goals of educational programs at state correctional institutions. A number of questionnaires and interview forms are appended. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. A. Dusewicz
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED159216

EFFECTIVENESS OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF EX-OFFENDERS

Final Report

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS
Office of Planning and Evaluation
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

SEPTEMBER 30, 1977

TM007 524

EFFECTIVENESS OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF EX-OFFENDERS

FINAL REPORT

PREPARED BY:

Joan L. Buttram

and

Russell A. Dusewicz

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Office of Planning and Evaluation
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

September 30, 1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study involved intricate procedures, communications and interdependencies with a variety of agencies and individuals without whose cooperation the study would not have been possible.

Acknowledgement is appropriate for Education Directors and their staffs at each of the eight state correctional institutions, who served to facilitate the pre-release interview process and supplied the necessary associated educational records. Acknowledgement is also appropriate for: Hermann Tartler, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole; David Gearhart, Chief of Inmate Data Services; and Probation and Parole Agents throughout Pennsylvania, who assisted in identifying and locating ex-offenders after their release.

For their assistance in all phases of the study, appreciation is expressed to: Jim Lewis, Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, Division of Research, Pennsylvania Department of Education; staff of the Office of Corrections Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education; and the Bureau of Corrections.

Special appreciation is also expressed to those offenders/ex-offenders who volunteered participation in the study and whose interest and cooperativeness over a period of several months helped to bring a complex and difficult undertaking to a successful conclusion.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since August of 1974, the Pennsylvania Department of Education has been responsible for administration, organization and coordination of educational programs in Pennsylvania's eight State Correctional institutions. These programs presently include adult basic education, general educational development, vocational education, post-secondary education and related career counseling and job placement services. As part of the state-wide emphasis upon the concept of quality education in Pennsylvania, an effort was undertaken, through the present study, to evaluate the effectiveness of the education programs at state correctional institutions. This evaluation focused upon the success of these programs in promoting post-release employment and social adjustment.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the study, therefore, was to conduct a follow-up of ex-offenders five to six months after release. The follow-up would determine the extent to which those who had participated in educational programs prior to release benefitted differentially with respect to employment and social adjustment as compared with those who had not participated in such programs. It was hoped that results would provide the necessary information and feedback essential to developing and maintaining quality programs that are realistic to the needs of the offender.

PROCEDURES

The design of the study called for data gathering on both a pre- and post-release basis for a large number of variables via institutional records, personal interviews, test administrations and rating forms. Pre-release information would be used to establish comparability of educational program enrollment and non-enrollment groups. Post-release information, on the other hand, would be utilized as criterion measures for judging educational program effectiveness.

A total of 157 inmates scheduled for release during January, February and March of 1977 were interviewed prior to their anticipated date of release. These individuals were traced after release and interviewed five to six months later to determine their employment status and social adjustment. Only 133 of those originally interviewed were found to have actually been released. Of this total post-release sample, educational program enrollment prior to release was found to be as follows: Adult basic education and/or general educational development programs (ABE/GED) - 45; vocational education program - 35; post-secondary education program - 13; no enrollment - 35; unclassified - 5. These groups, with the exception of the unclassified, served as the basis for making judgments about the relative effectiveness of educational programs.

FINDINGS

Standard statistical analyses were performed comparing each of the educational program enrollment groups to the no enrollment control group

on a number of criterion variables. Among these variables were: employment status, employment adjustment, general social adjustment, and absconding/recidivism.

The only positive finding favoring the educational groups related to the post-secondary program. Ex-offenders enrolled in post-secondary education programs were found to have violated parole and/or been arrested significantly fewer times than were those in the no enrollment control group.

Not withstanding this finding, no overall consistent pattern of significant differences were observed among any of these groups. Thus, on the whole, educational programs were found to be relatively ineffective in promoting post-release employment and social adjustment.

Implications are drawn for a re-examination of the goals of educational programs at state correctional institutions and a reappraisal of educational course offerings and content toward achieving an overall integrated approach at achieving such goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	
II.	SUMMARY OF PRE-RELEASE INTERVIEW PROCEDURES AND DATA	
	Pre-Release Instrumentation	3
	Sample Selection and Scheduling of Interviews	8
	Pre-Release Visits	8
	Educational Program Enrollment of Pre-Release Sample	10
	Comparability of Pre-Release Educational Program Groups	12
	Summary of Pre-Release Procedures	18
III.	POST-RELEASE INTERVIEW PROCEDURES	
	Establishment of Post-Release Variables	19
	Instrument Construction	21
	Sample Selection and Scheduling of Post-Release Interviews	26
	Post-Release Interviews	28
	Post-Release Data Preparation	32
	Summary of Pre- and Post-Release Procedures	32
IV.	POST-RELEASE DATA AND RESULTS	
	Demographic Data	34
	Length of Release Time	44
	Post-Release Employment Data	45
	Post-Release Social Adjustment Data	58

Page

Educational Program Involvement Data 61

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Pre- and Post-Release Employment 67

Pre- and Post-Release Social Adjustment 69

Educational Program Data 70

Evaluation Objectives 72

Implications of Current Study 77

APPENDIX A: PRE-RELEASE INSTRUMENTATION

APPENDIX B: POST-RELEASE INSTRUMENTATION

APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP COMMUNICATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This document represents the final report on the Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow-Up Study of Ex-Offenders. The study was designed by Research for Better Schools (RBS) to evaluate educational programs in state correctional institutions in terms of their effects upon post-release employment and social adjustment. Two earlier reports provide a perspective against which post-release findings may be interpreted and understood.[1] The current report presents major findings concerning post-release employment and social adjustment and the effects of educational programs on these variables.

Recommendations concerning further study and specific educational programs are made. Tracking and follow-up procedures employed in the current study are documented and may facilitate similar efforts in the future.

This report is organized into five main chapters. After the introductory chapter I, Chapter II summarizes the study's design, pre-release interview procedures, and data that were presented in earlier reports. Chapter III describes post-release procedures and instrumentation. Chapter IV summarizes post-release data. In the fifth and final chapter,

---

[1] "Synopsis of Pre-Release Data" and Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow-Up Study of Ex-Offenders - Interim Report (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1977).

individual objectives of the study are addressed in light of the data collected and recommendations made concerning current educational programs offered at state correctional institutions. This chapter then presents conclusions and implications of the study.

II. SUMMARY OF PRE-RELEASE PROCEDURES AND DATA

This chapter summarizes procedures and data concerning pre-release interviews conducted in February and March of 1977. Specific topics addressed include: (1) pre-release interview instrumentation, (2) sample selection and scheduling of interviews, (3) pre-release interview procedures, (4) educational program enrollment of pre-release sample, and (5) comparability of educational program groups. A complete accounting of the first four topics is presented in an earlier interim report.[2]

PRE-RELEASE INSTRUMENTATION

Instrumentation developed for use on a pre-release basis in the present study was designed to serve a dual purpose. These measures were to both provide a means for the gathering of basic descriptive statistical data on participating inmates as well as to serve as a means for securing data for use in assessing the pre-release comparability of educational program and control groups. This latter purpose was of particular importance in that program and comparison groups were constituted through self-selection. It is thus possible that differences might exist between inmates choosing one particular type of program over another or choosing to enroll in an educational program versus a decision not to enroll in any such program. Thus, the question of initial differences

---

[2] Ibid.

on pre-release variables believed to be related to post-release criterion measures must be addressed. Otherwise, it is difficult to know whether any observed differences on criterion measures are due to effects of educational program enrollment or, instead, a result of program groups having initially different degrees of certain attributes which are themselves capable of generating different effects on the criterion measures exclusive of any true educational program effects.

It was therefore essential that relevant pre-release variables be identified which might be expected to relate to post-release criterion measures, and that instruments be constructed to assess inter-group differences on these variables on a pre-release basis.

A careful consideration of the hypotheses of concern in the study together with a review of past research in corrections education yielded a number of variables which merited examination in connection with the above-stated purposes. Such variables clustered within the following general groupings: demographic and personal history variables, pre-institutional employment experience variables, intelligence and achievement test scores, institutional work adjustment variables and pre-release social adjustment variables. The groupings and the specific variables themselves are detailed further in an earlier document (Interim Report) and are evident, as well, in the pre-release instrumentation included in the Appendix of the present report.

Pre-release instrumentation was developed to address the above variables and groupings of variables. The instrument construction effort was sensitive to generally anticipated low inmate reading ability levels and to some extent drew upon adaptations of existing measures reported on previously in the literature where relevant to the specific needs and characteristics of the present study.[3] In addition, all instruments and procedures were examined by an Institutional Review Board to assure compliance with DHEW regulations on protection of human subjects (45 CFR as amended) and guidelines established by the American Psychological Association (Ethical Standards of Psychologists and Ethical Principals in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants).

The instrument design and construction effort culminated in the development of four separate pre-release instruments: (1) the Personal Interview Form, (2) the Pre-Release Social Adjustment Scale, (3) the Institutional Work Adjustment Scale, and (4) the Institutional Record Form. Samples of these measures are contained in Appendix A. Following are descriptions of each of the four instruments developed for use in the study.

Personal Interview Form

The Personal Interview Form was designed to collect information on personal and family characteristics, educational background, criminal

---

[3]See Interim Report

record and past employment history through an individually conducted personal interview with each participant in the study. The form consists of twenty-five items which can easily be completed in fifteen to twenty minutes.

Items contained in this form, other than those aimed simply at identification, were included on the basis of their reflecting characteristics shown to be related to post-release employment and social adjustment variables in prior studies evidenced in the literature.

Some items are specifically included to duplicate, intentionally, information available from institutional records such as the JBC-47A form on education and training and as reflected in the Institutional Record Form instrument. This was done in order to provide at least a rudimentary validity check on personal interview - obtained information through the cross-checking of these parallel data records.

Pre-Release Social Adjustment Scale

The Pre-Release Social Adjustment Scale is an instrument developed to assess inmate perceptions, attitudes, beliefs and characteristics relating to a variety of different variables believed from prior studies to be predictive of post-release social adjustment and employment. This pre-release instrument, designed to be administered as an individual self-report paper and pencil questionnaire, contains thirty-five social adjustment items requiring approximately fifteen minutes for completion.[4]

[4]This Scale was later reduced to thirty-four items as a result of the elimination of one item which was found to be subject to varied interpretations.

Items address variables relating to institutional adjustment, release anxieties, inmate solidarity, personality, identification and attitude toward criminal association and orientation.

Institutional Work Adjustment Scale

The Institutional Work Adjustment Scale is a sixteen-item measure of inmate performance on institutional work assignments. It was designed to be utilized as a rating form by which work supervisors assess the performance of inmates they supervise in terms of four areas: work quality, work interest and satisfaction, work leadership, and work dependency. Inmates are rated, according to given behaviors, on a four-point "always" to "never" scale.

Institutional Record Form

The Institutional Record Form represents, basically, a summary of information from inmate JBC-47A Education and Training Cumulative Records. It includes data on ethnicity, education level, current offense and sentence, intelligence and achievement test scores, institutional education and training, and institutional work and training assignments. The Institutional Record Form was designed as a replacement or substitute for the JBC-47A form in cases where a copy of the latter was not obtainable or was not available.

SAMPLE SELECTION AND SCHEDULING OF INTERVIEWS

All inmates eligible for parole during late January, during February, and during March were included in the pre-release sample, regardless of their participation in educational programs. This revision in the originally proposed design has been discussed in detail in earlier reports.[5]

From all parole lists gathered from state correctional institution Education Directors, Parole Offices, and Record Offices, 271 inmates were identified as eligible for parole. Arrangements for actual pre-release interview visits were then made with each institution. These visits required approval by each institution superintendent. Once approval was given, visits were scheduled by the Education Directors. They usually required three to four days advance notification. Prior to each visit, procedures and requirements were also reviewed to insure maximum use of the limited amount of available interview time.

PRE-RELEASE VISITS

Pre-release interviews were conducted by RBS from February 1 to March 15, 1977. All inmates eligible for parole during February and March were scheduled for interviews at each institution except Huntingdon and Dallas. Pre-release interviews were held on consecutive days at each institution with the exception of Camp Hill and Graterford. Return visits were made to these two institutions in order to complete interviews from the March parole eligibility list.

---

[5] See Interim Report. It should be noted that inmates from the January parole eligibility list were included in the sample. This was due to delays in their actual release dates which permitted them to be interviewed in February and March.

Briefly, the procedure followed for pre-release interviews was as follows:

- Issue passes for inmates to the institution's school.
- Describe and discuss purpose, design, and requirements of the study with each inmate.
- Explain confidentiality of data and right of each inmate to decline to answer any questions.
- Obtain inmate permission for release of specific information.
- Conduct personal interview.
- Supervise inmate's completion of the Pre-Release Questionnaire.
- Thank inmate for participation before return to cellblock, classes, or work assignment.

In contacting inmates initially about the study, passes were issued to inmates for specific times. This method proved ineffective in that passes provided no way of determining the reason for an inmate's failure to keep an appointment. With the help of institution officials, a second procedure was implemented in which follow-up telephone calls were made to cellblocks, etc. to locate missing inmates. Through this second procedure, it was discovered that inmates were often already released, assigned outside the prison facility, or confined in the Behavioral Adjustment Unit.

Information on the availability of inmates for pre-release interviews is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Availability of Inmates for Pre-Release Interviews

State Correctional Institution	Interviewed		Released Prior to Scheduled Visit		Unavailable		Ineligible		Declined to Participate		Could not Locate in Institution		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Camp Hill	27	17	2	9	14	47	4	40	2	9	2	7	51	19
Dallas	10	6	0	0	1	3	1	10	2	9	0	0	14	5
Graterford	37	24	11	48	3	10	0	0	1	5	11	38	63	23
Greensburg	25	16	2	9	1	3	4	40	4	18	1	3	37	14
Huntingdon	10	6	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	14	2	7	17	6
Muncy	13	8	1	4	1	3	0	0	2	9	0	0	17	6
Pittsburgh	28	18	4	17	7	24	1	10	4	18	10	34	54	20
Rockview	7	5	1	4	3	10	0	0	4	18	3	11	18	7
Total	157	58	23	8	30	11	10	4	22	8	29	11	271	100

Fifty eight (58) percent of inmates appearing on parole eligibility lists were actually interviewed prior to release. Eight (8) percent were released prior to the RBS scheduled visits, while 11 percent were unavailable for interviews due to prison assignments and another 11 percent could not be located within institutions. Eight (8) percent declined to participate in the study. Four (4) percent of the inmates appearing on parole eligibility lists were, in fact, not eligible for parole.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM ENROLLMENT OF PRE-RELEASE SAMPLE

Educational program enrollments of the pre-release sample are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Educational Enrollment of Pre-Release Sample

State Correctional Institution	ABE/GED		Vocational		Post-Secondary		No Enrollment		Not Classified		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Camp Hill	9	17	12	30	0	0	6	15	0	0	27	17
Dallas	6	11	0	0	2	13	1	2	1	10	10	6
Graterford	14	27	4	10	4	27	10	25	5	50	37	24
Greensburg	10	19	6	15	1	7	8	20	0	0	25	16
Huntingdon	4	8	2	5	0	0	4	10	0	0	10	6
Muncy	3	6	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	8
Pittsburgh	4	8	4	10	7	47	9	23	4	40	28	18
Rockview	2	4	2	5	1	7	2	5	0	0	7	5
Total	52	34	40	25	15	10	40	25	10	6	157	100

Approximately one third of the pre-release sample was enrolled in ABE/GED programs. Twenty five (25) percent were enrolled in vocational programs. Ten (10) percent were enrolled in post-secondary programs. One fourth of the pre-release sample was not enrolled in any educational program. The educational enrollment of 6 percent of the inmates could not be determined because no information was available from state correctional institution records.

COMPARABILITY OF PRE-RELEASE EDUCATION GROUPS

In an evaluative study in which program and comparison groups are constituted through self-selection, it is especially important that information be obtained as to their initial comparability on relevant variables. It is only by understanding the degree of equivalence in the initial composition of different program groups that an accurate interpretation of program effects can be made.

In the case of the present study, where inmate participation in educational programs is on a completely voluntary basis, there is some justification for expecting that those inmates choosing to become involved in such programs may differ significantly in certain respects from those who do not make such a choice. Indeed, it is reasonable to expect that differences may exist between inmates choosing one particular type of educational program over another. The major questions to be posed are whether significant initial inter-group differences exist and whether these differences could possibly relate to either of the two follow-up variables of post-release employment and social adjustment. It is therefore important that pre-release variables first be identified which might be expected to correlate with success on the post-release variables, and second that possible existence of initial inter-group differences on these variables be investigated. This task is especially critical if any confidence is to be placed in the inferring of program effectiveness on the basis of post-release differences in employment and social adjustment.

Because all inmates interviewed during pre-release visits were not actually released, only inmates actually released from state correctional institutions were included in analyses performed to determine the comparability of groups. These groups are thus a subset of the pre-release sample which consists of all inmates interviewed at state correctional institutions, regardless of whether or not they were actually released at some later point in time.

Four variables in particular were identified as important to establishing the initial comparability of groups. These variables were: (1) institutional work ratings by state correctional institution work supervisors, (2) pre-release social adjustment, (3) general intelligence level, and (4) functional literacy level. Each is addressed separately below.

Institutional Work Ratings

State correctional institution work supervisors were asked to rate inmates in four areas: (1) quality of work, (2) work interest and satisfaction, (3) work leadership, and (4) work dependency on the Institutional Work Adjustment Scale. Evaluations were returned for approximately 74% of the pre-release sample actually released. Table 3 presents average ratings for each measurement area across inmate groupings.

Table 3

Pre-Release Work Adjustment

	Quality		Interest		Leadership		Dependency	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
ABE/GED	17.27	33	5.15	33	10.48	29	8.48	29
Vocational	16.88	32	5.66	32	9.93	27	7.78	27
Post-Secondary	17.14	7	6.29	7	10.14	7	7.00	7
Enrollment	17.75	24	6.04	24	10.59	22	7.32	22
Unknown	19.33	3	4.33	3	10.33	3	5.33	3
Total	17.31	99	5.59	99	10.31	88	7.41	88

In order to test for differences between any single educational program group and the control or no enrollment group, "t" tests were conducted for each of the four scales. In order to take into account the rather small number of subjects within each group as well as the rather appreciable amount of error variance anticipated to be characteristic of most of the measurements utilized, the .10 level of confidence was used for interpretation of statistical results rather than the more traditional .05 level. The .10 level of confidence was used as well in all other analyses presented in this report. No significant differences were found between any of the three educational program groups and the no enrollment group.

Pre-Release Social Adjustment

During pre-release interviews, inmates were asked to respond to the Pre-Release Questionnaire, which was designed to measure social adjustment. Average scores for each group are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Pre-Release Social Adjustment

	Mean	N
ABE/GED	69.11	45
Vocational	71.68	35
Post-Secondary	71.53	13
No Enrollment	73.17	35
Unclassified	72.40	5
Total	71.21	133

Individual "t" tests were performed on social adjustment scores in order to test for significant differences between any single education group and the no enrollment control group. The .10 level of confidence was used in interpreting the results. A significant difference was found between the ABE/GED educational program group and the no enrollment group in terms of pre-release social adjustment. Ex-offenders enrolled in ABE/GED programs were shown to be less well adjusted than those ex-offenders enrolled in no educational programs. One possible explanation for this difference may be that ABE/GED programs in general are aimed at the lesser

educated inmate, and the lower level of education of such inmates may produce effects symptomatic of generally lower social adjustment.

Intelligence Level

Intelligence tests are administered to inmates as part of initial assessment procedures. Seventy three (73) percent of the pre-release inmates actually released were administered the Revised Beta Intelligence Test, 16 percent the California Test of Mental Maturity, and 11 percent the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. No intelligence test records were available for the remaining 63 inmates actually released. Because IQs for these tests are calculated using different methods, caution should be taken in interpreting these results. Table 5 presents group IQs for educational program and no enrollment groups.

Table 5

Intelligence Level

Educational Enrollment	Mean	N
ABE/GED	91.08	24
Vocational	93.57	21
Post-Secondary	102.00	3
None	99.13	22
Total	94.83	70

All group means fall within the normal range.

In order to test for differences between any single educational program group and the no enrollment control group, "t" tests were performed on the IQ data. No significant differences were found between any of the three educational program groups and the no enrollment control group in terms of IQ level.

Functional Literacy Level

It was also thought important to establish the level of functional literacy of each of the educational program and control groups. Functional literacy was measured by performance on the Wide Range Achievement Test (reading subtest scores) except for three inmates who were administered the Stanford Achievement Test (reading subtest) instead. Performance scores are reported in grade equivalent units; grade equivalents are not generally reliable and caution should therefore be taken in generalizing from these results. Table 6 presents functional literacy levels of each of the educational program and no enrollment groups.

Table 6

Level of Functional Literacy

Educational Environment	Mean Grade Equivalent	N
ABE/GED	7.97	37
Vocational	9.46	25
Post-Secondary	9.70	6
No Enrollment	8.46	29
Unclassified	15.30	1
Total	8.68	98

No significant differences in functional literacy level were found between any of the three educational program groups and the no enrollment control group.

Comparability of Groups

Individual educational program groups were compared to the no enrollment control group on four measures: (1) institutional work ratings, (2) pre-release social adjustment, (3) general intelligence, and (4) functional literacy level. Significant differences were found only with respect to pre-release social adjustment between the ABE/GED Program Group and the no enrollment control group. In all other respects, educational program groups did not differ significantly from the no enrollment control group.

SUMMARY OF PRE-RELEASE PROCEDURES

Pre-release interviews were conducted in February and March at all institutions. During pre-release interviews, information was collected about ex-offenders' criminal record, educational background, employment, and social adjustment. This information is useful in that it provides a context in which to interpret and understand post-release results. By determining the degree of initial equivalence between education program and no enrollment control groups, intergroup differences observed after release can be accurately interpreted in terms of program effects.

III. POST-RELEASE INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

In this chapter of the report, post-release interview procedures are described and discussed. This includes the establishment of post-release variables, instrument construction, sample selection and scheduling of post-release interviews, conducting of post-release interviews, and post-release data preparation. In addition, a summary of procedures used for both pre-release and post-release interviews is presented at the conclusion of this chapter.

ESTABLISHMENT OF POST-RELEASE VARIABLES

Employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders subsequent to release from state correctional institutions is of primary interest to this investigation. Post-release variables consequently focus on information concerning employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders since their release. In addition, information related to involvement of ex-offenders and attitude toward state correctional institution educational programs was obtained. Each of these three areas is described in more detail below.

Post-Release Employment Variables

Post-release employment variables were specified in the design of the study. These included: (1) employment status, (2) length of employment, (3) employment experience, (4) employment adjustment, (5) type of employment/further study sought and attained by ex-offender, and (6) evaluation of ex-offender's work habits by current employer. Each variable is discussed separately below. Selection of these variables was based on indications from past research as to their relationship to employment adjustment after release.

1. Employment Status. This variable addressed the current employment status of ex-offenders. Categories included: (1) full-time employment, (2) part-time employment, (3) enrollment in school, (4) involvement in drug or other rehabilitation program, and (5) unemployed.

2. Length of Employment Variable. This simply involved the total time in weeks for which the ex-offender had been employed on a full-time basis during the initial months following release.

3. Employment Experience. This variable included the following dimensions: (1) type and skill level of employment, (2) compensation level, (3) job satisfaction, (4) co-worker relationships, (5) job finding methods utilized, and (6) employment refusal (incidences of being refused employment and reasons for refusal).

4. Employment Adjustment. Dimensions included as part of employment adjustment were: (1) relationship with supervisors, (2) productivity, (3) satisfaction, (4) attitude, and (5) self-improvement.

5. Type of Employment/Further Study. This variable covered the type of employment and/or field of further study sought by ex-offender and the extent to which it was attained.

6. Ex-Offender Work Evaluation. This variable included the following dimensions: (1) relationship with supervisors, (2) productivity, (3) employee satisfaction with job responsibilities, and (4) co-worker relationships. It parallels information obtained on the employment adjustment variable.

Post-Release Social Adjustment Variables

Post-release social adjustment variables were specified as well in the study's design. They included an absconding/recidivism variable and a general social adjustment variable. Each is addressed separately below.

1. Absconding/Recidivism Variable. This variable grouped ex-offenders into one of two categories: (1) currently on released status with parole violations or arrests during the initial six months following release or (2) has violated parole or has been arrested during the initial six months following release.

2. General Social Adjustment Variable. This variable included the following dimensions: (1) housing, (2) employment, (3) psychological stress (anxiety, depression, irritability), (4) conflict with neighbors, (5) conflict with relatives, (6) addiction problems, (7) unrealistic expectations, (8) stigma, (9) relationship with old friends, (10) aggression and fighting, (11) handling money, and (12) family support.

Educational Program Variables

Included in educational program variables were: (1) educational enrollment, (2) reasons for enrollment or non-enrollment, (3) usefulness of educational programs since release from state correctional institutions, and (4) recommendations concerning education programs that would benefit post-release employment of ex-offenders.

INSTRUMENT CONSTRUCTION

Prior to actually constructing instruments, a survey of the literature was undertaken to review existing measurement instruments which might be

adaptable for use with the current study. While individual items from some existing instruments were found usable for addressing variables of interest in this study, no entire instruments were found to be appropriate. This was largely due to the highly specific nature of some of the existing instrumentation and the length of other existing measures. Moreover, many of the techniques used in association with existing instrumentation involve highly subjective procedures which have been criticized.

In view of the inadequacies of most existing instrumentation with respect to the variables of the current study, two instruments were designed which addressed all variables of concern. These instruments are: (1) Post-Release Interview and (2) Employer Work Rating (See Appendix B). Each is addressed separately below. All instruments were reviewed by Pennsylvania Department of Education representatives prior to use.

Post-Release Interview

This instrument can be divided into six parts: (1) Personal Information, (2) Employment Experience Scale, (3) Employment Adjustment Scale, (4) Post-Release Social Adjustment Scale, (5) Comments about Prison Programs, and (6) Employer Consent. Each of these sections is described in more detail below.

1. Personal Information. In this section of the interview instrument, ex-offender's current address and marital status is verified as well as the actual date of release from the state correctional institution obtained. The number of attempts to contact the ex-offender is also recorded.

2. Employment Experience Scale. Information is obtained about post-release employment experiences of ex-offenders. This section first addresses the current employment status of the ex-offender. If the ex-offender is employed full-time, more information about current employment is obtained. This includes types of work, preferred type of work, length of employment, weekly salary, absenteeism, and techniques used for locating current job. If the ex-offender is not employed full-time, other information is obtained regarding part-time work, enrollment in school, involvement in drug or other rehabilitation programs as well as activities engaged in for locating full-time work. Regardless of current employment status, information about any previous jobs is obtained. In addition, all ex-offenders are questioned about employment plans specified in their parole plan, incidences and reasons of employment refusals, and eligibility for veteran benefits.

3. Employment Adjustment Scale. If ex-offenders have not been employed full-time for at least 1 month, this section of the interview is not used. It is felt that without at least one month of experience on a particular job, the ex-offender's reactions might be neither consistent or valid. One month of experience is believed needed to provide sufficient time for the ex-offender to form sufficient, reliable and valid impressions to complete this section of the form. If ex-offenders have been employed full-time for at least one month, they are asked to comment on or rate their employment according to several factors. These factors are: (1) job satisfaction, (2) relationship with supervisors,

(3) relationship with co-workers, (4) productivity, (5) job attitude, and (6) self-improvement. Each factor is divided into one open-ended question which is intended to promote discussion by ex-offenders and then followed by two to four more specific questions. For example, in terms of productivity, ex-offenders are first asked how much work they are responsible for and then more specifically, "Do you have difficulty keeping up with your assigned work?" "Do you receive compliments about your work?," and "Do you think anyone else could do your job as well as you do?" This scale contains a total of 19 items.

4. Post-Release Social Adjustment Scale. All ex-offenders interviewed after their release are asked about their social adjustment. This area is introduced by suggesting that it might be helpful to discuss other aspects of their lives besides work in order to understand their situations more completely. Since this information was considered more personal or confidential in nature, it was thought necessary to explain its relevance to the study more specifically. Ex-offenders are asked to comment on 12 factors besides employment as specified in the study's original design these include: (1) housing/living arrangements, (2) employment, (3) handling money/ managing financially, (4) conflict with neighbors, (5) relationships with old friends, (6) conflict with relatives, (7) family support, (8) stress, (9) problems concerning prior criminal record, (10) aggression, arguments, fighting, (11) alcohol, (12) drugs, and (13) disappointment or unrealistic expectations. In each case, ex-offenders are asked to comment and to indicate whether they have (a) no problems, (b) minor problems, or

(c) major problems in this area. Prompts are also provided to facilitate discussion when necessary.

5. Comments about Prison Programs. In this section of the interview, actual enrollment in educational programs, reasons for enrollment or non-enrollment, usefulness of programs upon release, and recommendations about educational programs that would benefit post-release employment opportunities are addressed.

6. Employer Consent. If ex-offenders are currently employed full-time, they are asked to consent to the evaluation of their work by their current employer. It is explained that the form would be mailed to them first and then they would present it to the employer. This section simply obtains verbal consent and does not actually obtain any work evaluation.

The last item of the interview concerns parole violations or arrests since release. Incidence of parole violations or arrests is needed as one of the key indicators of post-release social adjustment. Since this is considered most sensitive, it is not asked until the conclusion of the interview in order to not influence or jeopardize other information obtained during the interview.

Employer Work Rating

This instrument is designed to obtain evaluation of ex-offenders' work habits by their current employer. It is based on a work evaluation form, Employer Performance Survey, used by the Pennsylvania Department of Education in other studies. The current form can be divided into three sections, each of which is described below.

1. Length of Employment. In this section, the employer is asked to indicate the number of months of employment of the ex-offender.

2. Work Habits Ratings. The employer is asked to rate the ex-offender in 11 areas: (1) quality of work, (2) quantity of work, (3) possession of specific job related knowledge, (4) willingness to accept responsibility, (5) punctuality, (6) ability to work without supervision, (7) willingness to learn and improve, (8) rapport with co-workers, (9) cooperation with supervisor, (10) compliance with company policies, and (11) work attendance. Each of these is rated on a 3 point scale: above average, about average, and below average.

3. Overall Comparative Ranking. In the final section, the ex-offender is rated in comparison to other workers in the same work group on overall competency, effectiveness, proficiency, and general overall work attitudes Four responses are provided to the employer: (1) top ¼, (2) top ½, but not top ¼, (3) bottom ½, but not lowest ¼, and (4) lowest ¼.

SAMPLE SELECTION AND SCHEDULING OF POST-RELEASE INTERVIEWS

All inmates interviewed before their release from state correctional institutions were scheduled for follow-up interviews approximately six months after their release. Because parole lists were not always available until only a few days before inmates' scheduled release, all inmates eligible for parole were included in the pre-release interview sample with the expectation that some might not actually be released. Fifteen (15) percent of the pre-release interview sample was not released and consequently not included in the post-release sample. Final size of post-release sample was 133.

Scheduling of Post-Release Interviews

Post-release interviews were scheduled from August 1 to September 19. This allowed for maximum release periods of approximately 5 to 6 months, depending on ex-offender's actual release date from the state correctional institution. Although it was planned that post-release interviews would not be conducted until August, tracking or follow-up procedures were formally initiated in mid-April and continued until the conclusion of the post-release interview period on September 19. These procedures are described below.

- During pre-release interviews, anticipated addresses and telephone numbers were obtained from inmates as to where they could be reached upon release. In many cases, inmates were unsure about post-release plans. In these cases, names, addresses, and telephone numbers of relatives or close friends were obtained who would most likely know the ex-offender's whereabouts. Although this information was sometimes inaccurate or incomplete, it provided a starting point for locating ex-offenders.

- In mid-April, the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole was contacted by RBS. He was able to verify actual release of inmates from state correctional institutions and provided names of parole agents assigned to these ex-offenders. He also informed all Board of Probation and Parole District Offices of the study and encouraged their support and cooperation. In addition, assistance was provided by the Chief of Inmate Data Services in locating and tracking ex-offenders on probation.

- Parole agents/probation officers of all ex-offenders were contacted by mail in late May. This letter reviewed the purpose of the study and asked for their assistance in contacting ex-offenders assigned to them. They were asked specifically to provide current addresses and telephone numbers of ex-offenders. Those who had not responded by mid-June were contacted by telephone for the same information. It was found that some of the ex-offenders had either been recommitted or absconded and were dropped from the post-release interview sample.

- Based on information obtained from the ex-offender prior to release from the state correctional institution and from the parole agent/probation officer, follow-up information was sent to all ex-offenders included in the post-release sample (See Appendix C). This reviewed the purpose of the study, ex-offender's participation in the study prior to release, and information concerning the post-release interview. Ex-offenders were asked to return a Follow-Up Information Sheet which asked for their current address, telephone number, employer, and times they could be reached.

- Post-release interviews were conducted by telephone from August 1 to September 19. Ex-offenders who did not have access to telephones were sent letters in mid-August asking them to call RBS. If these calls were long distance, ex-offenders were instructed to call collect.

- Parole agents/probation officers were re-contacted in cases where follow-up information was found to be incorrect or all efforts to contact ex-offenders were unsuccessful. In some cases, the ex-offender had moved or been recommitted. In other cases, the information was correct and efforts to contact ex-offender continued.

- In early September all ex-offenders who had not been interviewed were sent letters reviewing the study and asking them to call RBS within the next week.

- Efforts to contact ex-offenders for post-release interviews were terminated on September 19, 1977.

POST-RELEASE INTERVIEWS

Post-release interviews were conducted by telephone from August 1 to September 19, 1977. Table 7 presents data regarding the follow-up of ex-offenders, including the numbers available for interviews and the numbers actually interviewed.

Table 7

Follow-Up of Ex-Offenders

State Correctional Institution	Interviewed After Release		Absconded/ In Prison		No Response to Requests for Interviews		Not Released from SCI		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Camp Hill	13	18	6	23	4	14	4	17	0	0	27	17
Dallas	2	3	2	8	1	3	4	17	1	20	10	6
Graterford	16	21	7	26	7	25	7	29	0	0	37	24
Greensburg	14	19	4	15	5	18	0	0	2	40	25	16
Huntingdon	6	8	3	12	0	0	1	4	0	0	10	6
Muncy	9	12	0	0	3	11	1	4	0	0	13	8
Pittsburgh	13	18	3	12	5	18	5	21	2	40	28	19
Rockview	1	1	1	4	3	11	2	8	0	0	7	4
Total	74	47	26	17	28	18	24	15	5	3	157	100

Eighty-five (85) percent of the original pre-release interview sample was actually released from State Correctional Institutions and included in the post-release interview sample. Sixty-nine (69) percent of the possible post-release interview sample was actually interviewed. Twenty-six (26) percent did not respond to requests by telephone or mail for interviews. Five (5) percent either could not be located or was unavailable for interviews.

Content of Post-Release Interviews

Post-release interviews can be divided into five sections or content areas: (1) introduction and review of study, (2) ex-offender's employment since release, (3) post-release social adjustment of ex-offender, (4) state correctional institution educational involvement of ex-offender, and (5) obtaining consent for post-release work rating by current employer. Each is discussed separately below.

1. Introduction and Review of Study. Before progressing with the actual interview, interviewers introduced themselves and reviewed the purpose of the study and the post-release interview. Ex-offenders were informed that all information would remain confidential and that they might decline to answer any question. Any questions ex-offenders had regarding their participation in the study were also answered at this time.

2. Post-Release Employment of Ex-Offender. Ex-offenders were asked about their current employment status. This included not only full-time employment, but also part-time employment, enrollment in school, or involvement in drug or other rehabilitation programs. If ex-offenders were looking for work, information regarding their efforts was also recorded. Finally, for ex-offenders employed full-time for at least one month, information concerning their job satisfaction, relationship with supervisor and co-workers, and productivity was obtained.

3. Ex-Offender Post-Release Social Adjustment. During this part of the interview, ex-offenders were asked about their social adjustment since release. Specific topics discussed included housing, financial management,

relationship with relatives, friends, and neighbors, stress or arguments since release, and general satisfaction of events since release.

4. Educational Involvement of Ex-Offender. Ex-offenders were asked about their participation in educational programs at state correctional institutions. Reasons for participation or non-participation were obtained as well as evaluation of programs by ex-offenders. Suggestions or recommendations concerning programs which would improve employment opportunities of ex-offenders upon release were also discussed.

5. Post-Release Employer Work Rating. Before concluding interviews, the possibility was discussed of obtaining post-release employer evaluations of ex-offender work habits. The work evaluation form, Employer Work Rating, was mailed to ex-offenders who agreed to submit it to their employers. If ex-offenders did not agree to this procedure, no post-release work evaluation was undertaken. Completed work evaluations were to be returned by mail directly to RBS from employers.

Ex-Offender Cooperation

All ex-offenders who were contacted via telephone agreed to post-release interviews. All but one ex-offender completed the interview. Length of post-release interviews ranged from 10 to 45 minutes. The significant variation in interview length resulted primarily from two factors: (1) the markedly shortened interview when ex-offenders were unemployed, and (2) the willingness of the ex-offenders to volunteer or discuss additional information.

POST-RELEASE DATA PREPARATION

From approximately July 1 on, RBS was actively engaged in collecting, tabulating, summarizing, verifying and analyzing post-release data. This included tracking missing information, clarifying other information, and organizing, formatting, coding, and analyzing data on the post-release sample. Post-release data can be divided into five categories: (1) data provided by ex-offenders during pre-release interviews about criminal record, employment history, and social adjustment, (2) ex-offender's employment history, experience, and adjustment since release, (3) social adjustment of ex-offenders since release, (4) educational involvement and comments of ex-offenders while in state correctional institutions, and (5) post-release employer work ratings. Except for work ratings by post-release employers, all post-release employment and social adjustment information was obtained from ex-offenders and not verified by other sources.

SUMMARY OF PRE-AND POST-RELEASE PROCEDURES

Procedures used both to schedule and conduct pre- and post-release interviews are documented in this section. Because they have been described in narrative fashion in other sections of the Interim and Final Reports, they are presented in summary form in the table below.

Table 8

Pre- and Post- Release Procedures

TASK	TIME PERIOD
Design and construction of pre-release instrumentation	January 1 - 15
Establishment of liaison with SCI Directors of Education and arrangements for pre-release visits	January 16 - 31
Conducting of pre-release interviews at SCIs	February 1 - March 15

SCI	Date of Visit	# of Inmates Interviewed
Graterford	February 2 - 4 March 11	37
Huntingdon	February 3	10
Muncy	February 3 - 4	13
Rockview	February 4	7
Greensburg	February 8	25
Pittsburgh	February 8 - 9	28
Camp Hill	February 14, 25	27
Dallas	February 25	10

Collection, tabulation, and summary of pre-release data	March 1 - April 30
Verification of actual release and identification of parole agents or probation officers	April 15 - May 30
Establishment of liaison with parole agents or probation officers for locating ex-offenders	May 15 - June 30
Design and construction of post-release instrumentation	May 30 - July 30
Initiation of contact with ex-offenders via Follow-up Information Sheet	July 1 - July 30
Conducting of post-release interviews	August 1 - Spetember 19
Reverification of ex-offender current address and telephone number with parole agents/probation officers	August 15 - September 19
Requests to ex-offenders without telephones to call RBS for post-release interviews	August 26
Requests to all ex-offenders not yet interviewed to call RBS for post-release interviews	September 8
Collection, tabulation, and summary of post-release data	September 1 - 30

IV. POST-RELEASE DATA AND RESULTS

Data presented in this section refer only to the post-release sample. This sample includes ex-offenders who were actually interviewed after their release as well as those ex-offenders released but not interviewed. This sample differs from the pre-release sample in that it excludes those who were not actually released from state correctional institutions.

Post-release data can be divided into four areas: (1) demographic data obtained from ex-offenders during pre-release interviews, (2) post-release employment data, (3) post-release social adjustment data, and (4) data concerning educational program involvement and recommendations. Each of these areas is addressed separately.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

During pre-release interviews, information was obtained about ex-offender's marital status, educational level, criminal record, and employment history. This information was summarized in the Interim Report. Because 15 percent of the pre-release sample was in fact not released, it was thought important to reanalyze and present data on certain demographic variables for the post-release sample only. Data were resubmitted to analyses on: marital status; educational level; current offense; minimum sentence; juvenile and adult convictions; employment status, type of employment, and weekly earnings for employment at time of last offense; longest period of single employment; and largest weekly salary. These

variables were selected because they were found to be most important in past research and also because they are representative of pre-release data collected on ex-offenders.

Marital Status

Marital status was obtained initially during pre-release interviews and verified during post-release interviews. Table 9 presents marital status data.

Table 9

Marital Status

Marital Status	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	53	71	37	63	90	67
Married	10	14	12	20	22	17
Separated/ Divorced	11	15	10	17	21	16

Two-thirds of the ex-offenders were single. Seventeen (17) percent were married while 16 percent were either separated or divorced. Almost equal percentages were obtained in the pre-release sample.

Educational Level

Educational levels for both the post-release respondents and non-respondents are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Educational Level of Post-Release Sample

Group	Grammar		High School		Post-Secondary	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondents	7	9	58	79	9	12
Non-Respondents	7	12	52	88	0	0
Total	14	11	110	83	9	7

Eighty three (83) percent were at the high school level, 11 percent at grammar levels, and 7 percent at post-secondary level. This closely paralleled the pre-release sample educational level composition.

Criminal Record

Variables submitted to reanalysis include current offense, minimum sentence, and number of juvenile and adult convictions. These variables are representative of pre-release data collected on ex-offenders. Each is presented separately.

1. Current Offense. During pre-release interviews, ex-offenders were asked for their current offense. When possible, their responses were verified with institution records. Table 11 summarizes current offense data.

Table 11

Current Offense of Post-Release Sample

Current Offenses	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Theft, burglary, & related	18	24	23	42	41	32
Drugs & related	10	14	2	4	12	9
Non-robbery assault & related (including rape)	4	5	6	11	10	8
Robbery & related	24	33	20	36	44	34
Murder & related	11	15	3	5	14	11
Other	7	9	1	2	8	6

Approximately one-third were each committed to state correctional institutions for theft, burglary, and related offenses or robbery and related charges. No significant differences in composition were found between pre- and post-release samples.

2. Minimum Sentence. Minimum length of current sentence was also obtained during pre-release interviews. Table 12 presents minimum sentence data for the post-release sample.

Table 12

Post-Release Sample's Minimum Length of Current Sentence

Length of Minimum Sentence	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Indefinite	5	7	3	5	8	6
Less than 6 mo.	17	23	11	19	28	21
7-12 mo.	16	22	14	24	30	23
13-24 mo.	17	23	21	35	38	28
25-36 mo.	5	7	4	7	9	7
37-48 mo.	4	5	4	7	8	6
5-9 years	7	9	2	3	9	7
Greater than 10 yr.	3	4	0	0	3	2

The majority of the post-release sample was required to serve less than 2 years before eligible for parole. This closely paralleled the required length of sentence for the pre-release sample.

3. Juvenile Convictions. Ex-offenders were asked for their juvenile convictions during pre-release interviews. Their responses are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13

Number of Juvenile Convictions

Number of Juvenile Convictions	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	48	65	30	53	78	60
1	16	22	19	33	35	27
2	8	10	3	5	11	8
3 or more	2	3	5	9	7	5

Three-fifths of the post-release sample had no juvenile convictions, another fourth had only one conviction. Similar proportions were obtained for the pre-release sample.

4. Adult Convictions. Ex-offenders were also asked for their number of adult convictions. Table 14 presents number of adult convictions data.

Table 14

Number of Adult Convictions

Number of Adult Convictions	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	31	43	28	47	59	45
1	17	23	12	20	29	22
2	7	10	5	8	12	9
3	8	11	6	10	14	11
4	4	5	3	5	7	5
5	3	4	1	2	4	3
6 or more	3	4	4	7	7	5

Two-thirds of the post-release sample had not more than one adult conviction. This closely parallels proportions for the pre-release sample.

Employment

Variables submitted to reanalysis include: (1) employment status at time of last offense, (2) type of employment at time of last offense, (3) length of employment at time of last offense, (4) weekly earnings at time of last offense, (5) longest period of single employment, and (6) largest weekly salary. Each is presented separately.

1. Employment Status. During pre-release interviews, ex-offenders were asked about their employment status at the time of their last offense. Their responses are categorized in Table 15 below.

Table 15

Post-Release Sample's Employment Status

Employment Status	Respondents N	%	Non-Respondents N	%	Total N	%
Full-time	35	47	25	42	60	45
Part-time	3	4	6	10	9	7
In School	3	4	2	4	5	4
Unemployed	33	45	26	44	59	44

Almost equal percentages were employed full-time or were unemployed. Similar percentages were found with the pre-release sample initially.

2. Type of Employment. For those ex-offenders who were employed at the time of their last offense, type of employment was also collected. This data is presented in Table 16 below.

Table 16

Post-Release Sample's Type of Employment

Type of Employment	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Carpentry & Related	7	10	13	22	20	15
Factory	5	7	5	8	10	8
Machine & Related	5	7	3	5	8	6
Cab/Truck Driving	4	5	3	5	7	5
Food Service	7	10	1	2	8	6
Janitorial	3	4	3	5	6	5
Other	9	12	0	0	9	7
Unemployed	34	45	31	53	65	48

The largest percentage of ex-offenders was employed in carpentry or related fields. An almost equal distribution was obtained across the other categories. Post-release sample percentages parallel those of the pre-release sample.

3. Length of Employment. Length of employment data were obtained for those ex-offenders employed. This is summarized in Table 17.

Table 17

Length of Employment of Post-Release Sample

Length of Employment	Respondents N	%	Non-Respondents N	%	Total N	%
3 mo. or less	11	29	8	26	19	28
4-6 mo.	4	11	4	13	8	12
7-12 mo.	6	16	7	23	13	19
13-18 mo.	6	16	1	3	7	10
19-24 mo.	2	5	1	3	3	4
25-36 mo.	2	5	2	6	4	6
37 mo. or more	6	16	6	20	12	17
Unknown	1	2	2	6	3	4

Approximately three-fifths of the post-release sample had been employed for less than 1 year. The post-release sample distribution closely matched that of the pre-release sample.

4. Weekly Earnings. Ex-offenders were asked their weekly salary at the time of their last offense. This data is presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Weekly Earnings of Post-Release Sample

Weekly Earnings	Respondents N	%	Non-Respondents N	%	Total N	%
76 or less	6	16	1	3	7	10
76-125	10	26	17	55	27	39
126-175	10	26	6	19	16	23
176-275	6	16	3	10	9	13
275 or more	2	5	4	13	6	9
Unknown	4	11	0	0	4	6

Over half of the ex-offenders employed at the time of their last offense earned less than $125 a week. Weekly earnings distributions of the pre- and post-release samples closely resembled each other.

5. Longest Period of Employment. All ex-offenders were asked for their longest period of employment. Table 19 summarizes their responses.

Table 19

Longest Period of Single Employment

Length of Employment	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 mo.	4	5	2	3	6	5
1-3 mo.	2	3	5	8	7	5
4-6 mo.	10	14	6	10	16	12
7-12 mo.	15	20	20	34	35	26
13-18 mo.	11	15	0	0	11	8
19-24 mo.	8	11	4	7	12	9
25-36 mo.	10	14	5	8	15	11
37 mo. or greater	14	18	17	30	31	24

One-fourth of the ex-offenders had each been employed 7-12 months or 37 months or greater. Only 5 percent had never been employed. Post-release sample ex-offenders did not differ from the pre-release sample in longest length of single employment.

6. Largest Weekly Earning. Largest weekly earning was also obtained from ex-offenders during pre-release interviews. This information is presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Largest Weekly Earning

Weekly Earning	Respondents		Non-Respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	4	5	1	2	5	4
75 or less	4	5	3	5	7	5
76-125	28	39	20	34	48	36
126-175	12	16	12	20	24	18
176-275	17	23	12	20	29	22
276 or greater	7	9	8	14	15	11
Unknown	2	3	3	5	5	4

Largest weekly earnings of ex-offenders ranged primarily from $76 to $275. This distribution closely resembled that of the pre-release sample.

Summary of Demographic Data

The post-release sample did not differ markedly from the pre-release sample on any of the demographic variables described above. No biases in the post-release sample appeared in comparison to the pre-release sample.

LENGTH OF RELEASE TIME

Ex-offenders' length of time since release from state correctional institutions was calculated. Table 21 reports length of release time data.

Table 21

Length of Release Time

Education Group	Mean	N
ABE/GED	24.85	26
Vocational	23.42	19
Post-Secondary	25.22	9
No Enrollment	24.50	18
Total	24.43	72

Release time averaged approximately 24 weeks. Individual educational groups did not differ markedly from each other.

POST-RELEASE EMPLOYMENT DATA

Data presented in this section refers only to post-release employment information. It consequently only concerns ex-offenders who were actually interviewed after their release from state correctionsl institutions. No employment information was available on ex-offenders who were either unavailable or did not respond to requests for post-release interviews. Data presented address: (1) current employment status, (2) length of employment, (3) post-release employment experiences, (4) employment adjustment, (5) type of employment desired, (6) evaluation of ex-offender work habits by current employer, and (7) veteran benefits eligibility. Veteran benefits eligibility is presented along with

employment data in that it relates to continued schooling, one alternative to employment. Data for each variable is presented separately.

Current Employment Status

Information was obtained from ex-offenders about their employment status at the time of the post-release interview. Table 22 summarizes current employment status data by educational program enrollment.

Table 22

Employment Status of Post-Release Respondents

Employment Status	ABE/GED N	%	Vocational N	%	Post-Sec. N	%	None N	%	Total N	%
Full-time	10	38	10	50	4	40	7	39	31	43
Part-time	3	12	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	5
School	3	12	3	15	3	30	2	11	11	15
Drug/Rehab Program	0	0	1	5	1	10	3	17	5	7
Employed FT + Other	1	4	1	5	1	10	1	5	4	5
Unemployed	9	34	4	20	1	10	5	28	19	25
Total	26	35	20	27	10	13	18	25	74	100

Forty-three (43) percent of the post-release respondents were employed full-time. Five (5) percent were working full-time as well as working part-time, attending school, or involved in a rehabilitation program. Another 5 percent were working part-time or irregularly at odd jobs.

Fifteen (15) percent were attending school while 7 percent were involved in drug or other rehabilitation programs. Twenty-five (25) percent indicated that they were currently unemployed.

Length of Employment

For those post-release respondents who indicated full-time employment, length of employment data were obtained. They are summarized in Table 23.

Table 23

Length of Full-Time Employment

Educational Program	Mean	Range	N
ABE/GED	10.54	0.2 - 23	11
Vocational	8.45	2 - 26	11
Post-Secondary	20.40	10 - 25	5
None	17.75	4 - 27	8
Total	12.89	.2 - 27	35

The average length of employment was approximately 13 weeks, although it ranged from less than 1 week to a maximum of 27 weeks.

In order to test differences between any of the individual educational program groups and the no enrollment control group, "t" tests were performed on length of employment data. Significant differences at the .01 level were found in comparing the ABE/GED or Vocational Education Programs with the no enrollment control group. Both of these educational

program groups were employed for significantly less time than the no enrollment control group. No significant difference was found between the Post-Secondary Education Program and the no enrollment control group.

Post-Release Employment Experiences

Post-release employment experience data include: (1) type of employment, (2) compensation levels, (3) job finding methods utilized, (4) employment refusal (incidences of being refused employment and reasons for refusal), (5) availability of parole plan employment, and (6) length and weekly salary of all full-time employment since release. Information concerning job satisfaction and co-worker relationships is presented with employment adjustment data.

1. Type and Skill Level of Employment. Type and skill level of employment data were obtained from post-release respondents. Table 24 presents this information.

Table 24

Type of Work

Type of Work	N	%
Auto Repair	2	6
Cab/Truck Driving	1	3
Carpentry and Construction	11	31
Factory	4	12
Food Services	2	6
Janitorial and Maintenance	2	6
Machine and Related	5	15
Owner Business	2	6
Other	5	15

Almost one-third of employed ex-offenders were working in carpentry or construction related jobs. The next two largest single categories were machine and related jobs and factory work.

2. Compensation Levels. Gross weekly earnings were also obtained from post-release respondents. Table 25 summarizes weekly salary for those post-release respondents who were employed full-time.

Table 25

Salary of Full-Time Employees

Educational Program	$\bar{X}$	Range	N
ABE/GED	183	75 - 332	11
Vocational	121	90 - 200	10
Post-Secondary	200	120 - 400	5
None	251	150 - 420	7
Total	181	75 - 670	33

The average weekly earning was $181. Those who had not been enrolled in any state correctional institution educational program earned as a group the highest weekly salary of $251 while those who had been enrolled in vocational programs earned as a group the lowest weekly salary of $121.

Individual "t" tests were performed on weekly earnings data in order to test for differences between any of the individual education program groups and the no enrollment control group. The .10 level of significance was used. Significant differences were found between the

Vocational Education Program and no enrollment control group. Ex-offenders enrolled in vocational education programs earned significantly less than ex-offenders not enrolled in any education program. No differences in weekly earnings were found between either the ABE/GED or Post-Secondary Education Program and the no enrollment control groups.

3. Job Finding Methods Utilized. Methods ex-offenders used for finding their current full-time employment were recorded. Some ex-offenders indicated more than one method and consequently multiple responses were noted as well. Table 26 summarizes methods used by ex-offenders currently employed full-time.

Table 26

Job Finding Methods Utilized

Job Finding Methods	N	%
Newspaper ads	15	23
Friends/relatives	9	13
Prisoner's Aid Society	1	1
State Employment Service	9	13
Filing Applications with Employers	10	16
Employment Agency	3	4
SCI Placement Officer	5	7
Parole Officer	11	17
School Placement Service	1	1
Labor Union	1	1
Salvation Army	2	3
Other	1	1

The most frequently used method was responding to newspaper advertisements. Other methods which proved successful included assistance or leads from parole officers, filing applications with employers, assistance from friends and relatives or from the State Employment Service.

Job hunting methods and practices were also recorded for those post-release respondents who were not employed. Information recorded included: (1) field in which looking for work, (2) frequency of job searches, (3) occurrence of employment interviews, and (4) refusals of employment. Each is discussed separately.

a. Type of Work. Post-release respondents were asked to indicate fields in which they were looking for work. Their responses are summarized in Table 27.

Table 27

Employment Fields

Employment Field	N	%
Carpentry and Construction	4	10
Factory	7	18
Machine and Related	5	13
Cab/Truck Driving	1	3
Janitorial and Maintenance	4	10
Sales	1	3
Food Services	1	3
Anything	12	30
Other	4	10

Thirty (30) percent were looking for work in any field. Eighteen (18) percent were concentrating their efforts in locating factory work while 10 percent were hunting for carpentry and construction work or janitorial and maintenance work.

b. Frequency of Job Searches. Frequency of job searches was obtained for those ex-offenders who were actively looking for work and is summarized in Table 28.

Table 28

Frequency of Job Search

Frequency of Job Search	N	%
Everyday	9	38
2-3 times a week	10	41
Once a week	2	8
Less than weekly	3	13

Thirty-eight (38) percent were looking for work everyday while 41 percent were hunting several times a week. The remaining one-fifth looked for work on a weekly or less frequent basis.

c. Employment Interview Occurrence. Post-release respondents actively looking for work were asked if they had been interviewed for employment. Twelve (50 percent) indicated that they had been interviewed while the other half had not.

d. Employment Refusals. When asked if they had actually been refused employment, only three ex-offenders responded affirmatively. Reasons for refusal were criminal record (2) and not qualified (1). Many others indicated that they felt employers lost interest in hiring them when informed of their criminal record. Unfortunately, no systematic analysis of these comments was possible.

5. Availability of Parole Plan Employment. Many inmates are required to submit promises of employment as part of their parole plans. Forty-eight (48) percent had jobs as part of their parole plan, 52 percent did not. Of the 36 who did have jobs as part of their parole plans, jobs were not available for 13 (36 percent) upon their release. In almost all cases, the job was unavailable because the position had either already been filled or there was now insufficient work to warrant hiring the ex-offender.

6. Length and Salary of All Post-Release Employment. Forty-three (43) post-release respondents had been full-time employed some time since their release, although only 35 were actually employed at the time of the interview. For this reason, it was thought important to present information on all employment since release, not just current employment. When considering all post-release respondents who had been employed at any time since their release, they had on the average 1.47 jobs. Their average length of employment was 11 weeks, which was only 2 weeks less than the length of employment of ex-offenders who were currently employed at the time of the interview. Average weekly earnings were $150, $30

less than that of ex-offenders currently employed at the time of the interview. It should be noted that the decrease over time in number of ex-offenders employed resulted exclusively from lay-offs coupled with the inability to subsequently locate other employment.

Post-Release Employment Adjustment

Post-release employment adjustment was measured by the Employment Adjustment Scale. It specifically measures: (1) job satisfaction, (2) relationship with supervisors, (3) relationship with co-workers, (4) productivity, (5) job attitude, and (6) self-improvement. Because some items were not appropriate for all ex-offenders, total scores could not be calculated. Instead, overall average item scores are reported, ranging from 1 to 4, with higher scores representing better adjustment. Table 29 presents these data.

Table 29

Post-Release Employment Adjustment
of Post-Release Respondents

Educational Program	Mean	N
ABE/GED	2.56	13
Vocational	2.73	10
Post-Secondary	2.91	5
None	2.70	10
Total	2.69	38

Post-release employment adjustment for the total post-release respondent sample averaged 2.69 which is indicative of satisfactory adjustment to post-release employment.

In order to determine if participation in different educational programs facilitated post-release employment adjustment, ABE/GED, Vocational, and Post-Secondary educational groups were individually compared to the no enrollment group by use of "t" tests. No significant differences were found. Employment adjustment of ABE/GED, Vocational, or Post-Secondary educational program groups did not differ significantly from that of the no enrollment group.

Post-Release Training - Related Employment

Documentation was obtained of the type of employment and/or field of further study sought by the post-release respondents, especially as it related to vocational or post-secondary training initiated in educational programs at state correctional institutions.

In terms of vocational training received at state correctional institutions, only two (10 percent) were found to be employed in fields related to their training. Another, currently unemployed, was found to be looking for work in a related field. The remaining 85 percent were either not employed or not looking for work in fields related to the vocational training they received.

Ten post-release respondents enrolled in post-secondary education programs while incarcerated at state correctional institutions. All ten engaged in general fields of study. Although half have continued in school since their release, they are now enrolled in vocational or trade programs rather than college programs. The other five are not pursuing their education and are working in unrelated fields. In terms of post-secondary educational programs, therefore, none of the post-release respondents are employed, in school, or looking for work in related fields.

Ex-Offender Post-Release Work Evaluations

Although half of the ex-offenders agreed to evaluations of their work by their current employers, only three (17 percent) were returned to RBS prior to scheduled data analysis. Table 30 summarizes their employer evaluations.

Table 30

Employer Evaluations

Evaluation Measure	Mean	N
Length of Employment	4 mo.	3
Work Habits Rating (max = 33)	25.67	3
Comparative Ranking (max = 4)	3.33	3

Evaluations by employers were high. This may be a function of self-selection; that is, ex-offenders who may have received less positive evaluations may have been reluctant to submit them to employers or return them to RBS.

Veteran Benefits Eligibility

Indications of ex-offender eligibility for, and use of, veteran benefits for continued schooling were obtained. Table 31 presents veteran benefits data.

Table 31

Eligibility and Use of Veteran Benefits

Veteran Benefits	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Eligibility	6	8	68	92
Use	2	33	4	67

Only 6 (8 percent) of the post-release respondents were eligible for veteran benefits. Of these, only two were actually making use of veteran benefits to continue their education. The other four expressed no interest in continuing their education at the time.

POST-RELEASE SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT DATA

Data presented in this section relate to incidence of parole violations or arrests and general social adjustment since release. Each is addressed below.

Incidence of Parole Violations or Arrests

Information was obtained from ex-offenders, parole agents, and close relatives of ex-offenders regarding incidence of parole violations or arrests. Based on this information, ex-offenders were classified into four groups: (1) currently on released status and has had no parole violations or arrests since release, (2) currently on released status but has violated parole or been arrested since release, (3) currently incarcerated because of parole violations or arrests since release and (4) absconded from parole. Numbers in each classification are presented in Table 32 according to educational program enrollment.

Table 32

Incidence of Parole Violations or Arrests

Group	ABE/GED		Vocational		Post-Secondary		None		Unknown		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Violations or arrests	20	59	20	80	10	83	18	64	0	0	68	68
Released with violations or arrests	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Recommitted	7	20	4	16	2	17	6	21	1	100	20	20
Absconded	1	3	1	4	0	0	4	15	0	0	6	6
Total absconded, violations or arrests	14	41	5	20	2	17	10	36	1	100	32	32

In order to compare individual educational programs to the no enrollment or control group in terms of the absconding-recidivism variable, a Fisher Exact Probability Test was performed on these data. The .10 level of significance was used. A significant difference was found only between the Post-Secondary Education Program Group and the no enrollment control group. Ex-offenders enrolled in post-secondary education programs were found to have violated parole and been arrested less often than those ex-offenders who were not enrolled in educational programs. No difference on the absconding-recidivism variable was found between either the ABE/GED or Vocational Education Groups and the no enrollment control group.

General Social Adjustment

General social adjustment since release was measured by the Post-Release Social Adjustment Scale. It specifically addresses: (1) housing, (2) employment, (3) psychological stress, (4) conflict with relatives, friends, and neighbors, (5) addiction problems, (6) unrealistic expectations, (7) stigma, and (8) aggression and fighting. Educational group averages are reported in Table 33. Average item ratings are given in lieu of total scores. Scores can range from 1 to 13 with high scores indicative of good social adjustment.

Table 33

Post-Release Social Adjustment
of Post-Release Respondents

Educational Program	Total	
	$\bar{X}$	N
ABE/GED	11.95	26
Vocational	12.02	19
Post-Secondary	12.40	10
None	12.13	18
Total	12.07	73

As indicated above, all groups exhibited good social adjustment since their release. Specific problems in adjustment related primarily to the employment area, and disappointment over conditions since release. Few had encountered problems with their families, friends, and neighbors or with drugs and alcohol. A few had encountered some experiences where stigma was a problem relating to their criminal record and their incarceration; however most indicated that they had managed to ignore or avoid such problem areas.

ABE/GED, Vocational, and Post-Secondary Education groups were individually compared to the non-enrollment group in order to determine if educational program participation facilitated post-release social adjustment. Individual "t" tests were again employed in these analyses. No significant differences were found as a result of such comparisons. None

of the three education groups differed significantly from the no enrollment group in terms of general social adjustment since release.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT DATA

Educational program involvement data include: (1) educational enrollment, (2) reasons for enrollment or non-enrollment, (3) usefulness of educational programs since release from state correctional institutions, and (4) recommendations concerning educational programs that would benefit post-release employment of ex-offenders. Data for each are presented separately below.

Educational Enrollment

Enrollment in correctional education programs was obtained from ex-offenders who were actually interviewed after their release and from institution records. In approximately 10 percent of the cases, ex-offender verbal reports differed from those of the institution. In cases where discrepancies occurred, ex-offender verbal reports were accepted if they could identify course content or focus. Educational program enrollment of the post-release sample is presented in Table 34.

Table 34

Educational Enrollment of Post-Release Sample

Educational Program	Post-Release Respondents		Post-Release Non-Respondents		Total Post-Release Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE/GED	26	35	19	32	45	34
Vocational	20	27	15	25	35	26
Post-Secondary	10	14	3	5	13	10
None	18	24	17	29	35	26
Unclassified	0	0	5	9	5	4
Total	74	56	59	44	133	100

The largest percentage of the post-release sample (34 percent) was enrolled in ABE/GED programs. Equal percentages were enrolled in vocational programs or not enrolled in any program. Ten (10) percent were enrolled in post-secondary programs. Four (4) percent remained unclassified.

Persons for Enrollment or Non-Enrollment

Post-release respondents were asked the reasons for their enrollment or non-enrollment in educational programs. Responses of each group are presented separately.

1. Reasons for Enrollment. Post-release respondents reasons for enrollment are summarized in Table 35 below.

Table 35

Reasons for Enrollment

Reasons for Enrollment	N	%
Improve chance for parole	4	5
Improve job-related skills	17	20
Something to do in free time	22	27
Improve basic skills	5	6
Self-improvement	31	37
Other	4	5

Over one-third indicated that they had enrolled in educational programs in order to improve themselves. The second most frequently cited reason for enrollment was "something to do in free time." Another frequently cited reason was "to improve job-related skills." Few cited such reasons as "to improve basic skills" or "chances for parole."

2. Reasons for Non-Enrollment. Post-release respondents who did not enroll in educational programs were asked why they chose not to enroll. Their responses are summarized in Table 36.

Table 36

Reasons for Non-Enrollment

Reasons for Non-Enrollment	N	%
Not interested in pursuing education	4	24
Not enough time	8	47
Classes full	1	6
Educ. dept. never responded to inquiry	1	6
No comment	3	17

Almost half indicated that they were incarcerated for too short a period to allow for enrollment. Most of these were incarcerated at Greensburg. Another frequently cited reason was lack of interest in programs offered at state correctional institutions.

Usefulness of Educational Programs

Ex-offenders who had been enrolled in educational programs were asked to indicate whether these programs had been helpful since their release. Sixty-eight (68) percent felt that programs had been helpful, 32 percent did not. The same ex-offenders were then asked why programs had either helped or not helped them. Their responses are summarized below in Table 37.

Table 37

Helpfulness of Programs

Why Helpful	N	%	Why Not Helpful	N	%
Refresher/more experience	4	11	Too Difficult	1	6
Self Image/motivation	6	18	Not interested/got nothing from program	4	22
Learned new skills	18	49	Not enough time	2	11
Helpful job wise	3	8	Not helpful job wise	11	61
Relating to people	2	5			
Interest in learning	1	3			
Gain entrance to college	3	8			

Of those who thought programs had been helpful, the two most frequently cited reasons were that they had learned new skills (49 percent) and that they had improved their self image (16 percent). For those who thought

programs were not useful, the two most frequently cited reasons were: that programs were not helpful job wise, and that the programs were uninteresting.

Educational Program Recommendations

During post-release interviews, ex-offenders were asked to make recommendations about the types of educational programs that should be offered which would help in the area of employment. Their comments are summarized in Table 38.

Table 38

Educational Program Recommendations of Ex-Offenders

Recommendations	N	%
Increase vocational program offerings	43	48
Increase motivation of inmates/more counseling	12	13
Basic Skills/GED programs	4	5
Other	4	5
Current programs satisfactory	10	11
No suggestions	16	18

Almost half of the recommendations made by ex-offenders centered on increasing variety of, and improving content in, Vocational Education programs. Many pointed to the present lack of marketable job skills of ex-offenders and the criticality of vocational programs aimed at increasing job skills. They suggested that the focus of vocational courses be widened to include fields other than carpentry and construction (e.g., keypunching) and that current programs be upgraded.

Other ex-offenders indicated that problems facing state correctional institution programs were not because of program focus and content, but resulting from lack of motivation and interest on the part of ex-offenders. They suggested more careful screening and counseling programs along with efforts to increase interest in educational programs currently offered.

Others affirmed support for ABE/GED programs as well as Vocational and Post-Secondary programs currently offered. Suggestions for new programs included job finding seminars and ethnic/racial group studies.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter first summarizes pre- and post-release employment, social adjustment, and education data. Following this, individual objectives of the present study are addressed from the standpoint of the data presented. Finally, recommendations are made concerning educational programs offered at state correctional institutions as well as for further areas of investigation.

PRE- AND POST-RELEASE EMPLOYMENT

Employment data were collected and analyzed with regard to pre-release institutional work adjustment, current employment status, length of current employment, compensation level, and employment adjustment. The first measure was designed to establish the initial comparability of groups. The absence of significant differences on this measures enables post-release differences between individual educational program groups and the no enrollment group on the other four measures to be more easily attributed to program effects and not to initial between-group differences. Table 39 summarizes the results of these comparisons.

Table 39

Employment Comparisons

Employment Measure	ABE/GED vs. Control	Vocational vs. Control	Post-Secondary vs. Control
Pre-Release Institutional Work Adjustment	No difference	No difference	No difference
Post-Release Employment Status	No difference	No difference	No difference
Post-Release Length of Employment	Control > ABE/GED	Control > Vocational	No difference
Post-Release Compensation Level	No difference	Control > Vocational	No difference
Post-Release Employment Adjustment	No difference	No difference	No difference

No significant differences were found between any of the individual education program groups and the no enrollment control group in terms of institutional work adjustment. Each of the education program groups are thus considered comparable to the no enrollment control groups with respect to this pre-release variable. In terms of post-release employment, significant differences were found in favor of the no enrollment control group for two variables. Ex-offenders not enrolled in education programs were employed for significantly longer periods of time than ex-offenders enrolled in ABE/GED or Vocational Education programs and were paid more

than ex-offenders enrolled in Vocational Education programs. No other significant differences were found between individual education program groups and the no enrollment control group.

PRE- AND POST-RELEASE SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

In order to determine if significant differences occurred with regard to to social adjustment, data were analyzed concerning pre-release social adjustment, incidence of parole violations or arrests upon release, and post-release general social adjustment. As with employment, the first measure was used to determine initial comparability of groups prior to release and the other measures were used to assess program effects after release. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 40.

Table 40

Social Adjustment Comparisons

Employment Measure	ABE/GED vs. Control	Vocational vs. Control	Post-Secondary vs. Control
Pre-Release Social Adjustment	Control > ABE/GED	No difference	No difference
Post-Release Absconding/ Recidivism	No difference	No difference	Control > Post-Secondary
Post-Release General Social Adjustment	No difference	No difference	No difference

Significant differences were found with regard to pre-release social adjustment between the ABE/GED and no enrollment control groups. Ex-offenders not enrolled in education programs were more well-adjusted than ex-offenders enrolled in ABE/GED programs; these two groups are not considered comparable in terms of pre-release social adjustment. Significant post-release differences were found only in terms of the incidence of parole violations or arrests. Ex-offenders enrolled in Post-Secondary Education programs violated parole or were arrested significantly less often than ex-offenders in the no enrollment control group. No other significant differences were found in terms of post-release social adjustment.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DATA

In order to interpret pre- and post-release results more clearly, data were collected on: level of intelligence and functional literacy of ex-offenders prior to their release, evaluation of education programs by ex-offenders, and recommendations of ex-offenders concerning these programs.

Intelligence and Functional Literacy

As part of initial assessment procedures upon incarceration at state correctional institutions, inmates are administered intelligence and achievement tests. Analyses conducted to establish the comparability of all three education programs with the no enrollment control group indicated no significant inter-group differences on these test measures. That is, ABE/GED, Vocational Education, and Post-Secondary Education

programs were found not to differ from the no enrollment control group with respect to level of intelligence or functional literacy.

Ex-Offender Views on Education Programs

Reasons for enrollment or non-enrollment in education programs, evaluation of programs, and recommendations were obtained during post-release interviews and tabulated. Most ex-offenders enrolled in educational programs in order to improve their job-related skills or to occupy their time in prison. Reasons for non-enrollment given by ex-offenders included: a lack of interest in pursuing education, or insufficient time in institution to permit enrollment. When asked to evaluate state correctional institution programs, two-thirds of the ex-offenders responded positively by citing: the acquiring of new skills, the relearning of skills already acquired, and increased personal satisfaction. The one-third who evaluated programs negatively felt that the programs were not helpful job-wise, their primary purpose in enrolling in such programs initially. Half of the post-release respondents felt that more and varied vocational courses should be included in institution educational programs. Ex-offenders generally felt that insufficient numbers of quality programs now exist to meet their educational goals related to employment.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Twelve objectives were identified in the design of the present study as of primary importance. They generally focused on comparing employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders enrolled in one of three educational

programs to that of ex-offenders not enrolled in any program. Data concerning each objective are presented separately below.[6]

ABE/GED Evaluation Objectives

Three objectives were identified to assess the comparative effectiveness of ABE/GED Programs.

1. Effectiveness of ABE/GED Program in Terms of Employment. Post-release data for the ABE/GED program were compared to that of the no enrollment or control group on three variables: employment status, length of employment, and employment adjustment. Significant differences were found only with respect to the length of employment variable; ABE/GED educational program ex-offenders were employed for significantly less time than ex-offenders not enrolled in educational programs. No significant differences were found between ABE/GED educational program ex-offenders and no enrollment control ex-offenders in terms of employment status and employment adjustment.

2. Effectiveness of ABE/GED Programs in Terms of Social Adjustment. Post-release data for the ABE/GED program group were compared with that of the no enrollment control group on the absconding/recidivism and general social adjustment variables. No significant differences were found between the ABE/GED program group and the no enrollment control group on either of these variables.

---

[6]Because ABE and GED program groups were collapsed into a single group, the number of objectives was reduced from fourteen originally proposed to the present twelve. For a detailed accounting of the rationale for this change, the reader is referred to the Interim Report.

3. Functional Literacy Performance Levels of Exiting Offenders. Functional Literacy measures for the ABE/GED program group were compared to those of the no enrollment control group. No significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of functional literacy.

Vocational Education Program Objectives

Six evaluation objectives were identified in assessing the effectiveness of vocational programs.

1. Effectiveness of Vocational Program in Terms of Employment. Post-release data for the Vocational Education program group was compared with that of the control group on three variables: employment status, length of of employment, and employment adjustment. Ex-offenders enrolled in vocational programs were employed for significantly less time than ex-offenders not enrolled in any vocational program. No significant differences were found between the two groups on the other two measures.

2. Effectiveness of Vocational Programs in Terms of Social Adjustment. Post-release data for the Vocational Education program group was compared with the no enrollment control group on the absconding/recidivism and general social adjustment variables. No significant differences were found between the two groups on either variable.

3. Differential Effectiveness of Individual Vocational Programs in Terms of Success in Employment and Social Adjustment. Because of the rather large number of vocational courses offered and the limited post-release sample size, no analysis of the differential effectiveness of individual vocational courses was possible. Of the 20 ex-offenders

enrolled in vocational education courses, only four were enrolled in any single program. All others were either enrolled in a number of different programs, or their particular vocational course enrollment could not be obtained from state correctional institution records. No analyses were consequently possible with regard to this objective.

4. Extent to Which Vocational Graduates Seek Training-Related Jobs Upon Release. The analysis approach to this objective provided for the use of pre-release interview data concerning particular vocational course enrollment along with the kinds of employment each had secured after release from the institution. Eleven of the twenty ex-offenders enrolled in vocational programs prior to release were found to have been employed at the time of the post-release interview. Two of these eleven were employed in fields related to their vocational training. The remaining nine were employed in non-related fields. In addition of those who were employed, only one ex-offender was even looking for work in a related field. Therefore, it seems that Vocational graduates as a rule are not employed in fields related to training received at state correctional institutions.

5. Extent to Which Training in Vocational Course Proved Adequate in Practice for Ex-Offenders Who Are Employed in Training-Related Jobs. In addressing this objective, the adequacy of pre-release training was to be determined for ex-offenders who were enrolled in vocational courses during incarceration and were found to be employed within training-related jobs during the first six months following release. As only two ex-offenders were found to be employed in jobs

related to vocational training, no meaningful analysis relating to this objective could be undertaken.

6. Variety and Frequency of Reasons Given by Employers in Cases Where Employment is Refused to Ex-Offenders. Only three ex-offenders reported having been overtly refused employment. Reasons for these employment refusals given by ex-offenders were: criminal record (n = 2) and lack of qualifications for the position (n = 1). No meaningful analysis relating to this objective could be undertaken because of the relatively small incidence of overt employment refusal. It should be noted, however, that no accounting could be made of the incidences of covert employment refusals, where ex-offenders received no response to applications and interviews with employers.

Post-Secondary Education Program Objectives

In terms of Post-Secondary Education Programs, three evaluation objectives were addressed.

1. Effectiveness of Post-Secondary Education Programs in Terms of Employment. Comparisons on employment status, length of employment, and employment adjustment variables were made between the Post-Secondary Education Program Group and the no enrollment control group. No significant differences were found between these two groups on any of the three employment variables.

2. Effectiveness of Post-Secondary Education Program in Terms of Social Adjustment. Post-release data for the Post-Secondary Program Group was compared to that of the no enrollment control group on

the absconding/recidivism and general social adjustment variables. Although no differences were found between these two groups in terms of general social adjustment, the Post-Secondary Education Program Group was found to have had significantly fewer parole violations or arrests than the no enrollment control group. Moderate support is thus provided for the relative effectiveness of Post-Secondary Education programs in facilitating social adjustment.

3. Extent to Which Ex-Offenders Who Were Enrolled in Post-Secondary Education Programs Sought to Continue in Their Chosen Field, Either through Employment or Further Education, and the Extent to Which They Were Successful. None of the ex-offenders enrolled in post-secondary education programs were found to have continued in their chosen field of study in terms of employment or further education. It should be noted that all of the ex-offenders had engaged in general courses of study. Nevertheless, none had obtained employment in fields which allowed them to apply knowledge or skills gained through Post-Secondary programs. Moreover, those who were found to have continued their education were enrolled in trade or vocational programs of study. None continued in college programs upon release.

IMPLICATIONS OF CURRENT STUDY

The present study was intended to evaluate educational programs in state correctional institutions in terms of their effects upon post-release employment and social adjustment. Results of the study, however, do not indicate significant improvements in post-release experiences of ex-offenders as a result of enrollment in such programs. Only a single possible significant advantage was found anywhere: ex-offenders enrolled in Post-Secondary Education programs had violated parole or had been arrested less frequently than ex-offenders not enrolled in such programs. This study, therefore, does not provide evidence for the ability of present correctional education programs to improve or strengthen the employment or social adjustment of ex-offenders upon release.

The results suggest instead that correctional education programs are not achieving their ultimate goals or that impacts of such programs must be measured in other ways.

Possible Confounding Factors

Several reasons can be offered for the lack of significant effects obtained in the current study. The unemployment rate of the general population is high which can only decrease employment opportunities for ex-offenders. Ex-offenders, in general, have less marketable job skills, little, if any, work history, and poor work recommendations. In the tight job market of today, they are unable to compete effectively with other unemployed groups who often have adequate job skills and good work histories. Given these confounding factors, it then becomes extremely

difficult to demonstrate positive program effects in terms of post-release employment.

Post-release social adjustment measures also proved to be non-discriminating in terms of program effect. In the current study, social adjustment was defined as the ability of ex-offenders to adhere to the conditions of their parole as well as to locate employment and satisfactory living arrangements, manage financially, and interact with family, friends, and neighbors without significant problems. Although a significant number of inmates experienced continued difficulty in locating employment, they were able to arrange for satisfactory living arrangements, manage financially, and interact with their families, friends, and neighbors. It should be noted, however, that in almost all cases, provisions of ex-offenders' parole specified the attainment of satisfactory living arrangements and the maintenance of relationships with their families or friends. These provided a stable base upon which the ex-offender could build. In cases where ex-offenders were experiencing difficulties, these problems seemed less significant to them when viewed in the perspective of their prior confinement; that is, release from state correctional institutions compensated for any problems they were currently experiencing. In addition, six months may be too short a time interval to document program effects in terms of social adjustment. Almost all ex-offenders were under close supervision at the time of the post-release interview, and so had to adhere to all conditions of their parole. Due to the artificial conditions created by the parole situation, it then becomes more difficult

to document any difference in social adjustment between individual education program groups and the no enrollment control group.

There are other confounding factors which may in part account for the lack of significant findings of program effects. Inmates at state correctional institutions, for example, are permitted to select educational programs in which they wish to participate. Although no significant pre-release differences were found, education program groups may nevertheless differ from the no enrollment control group on other factors indirectly related to post-release employment and social adjustment on which no comparison data were collected. In addition, individual education program groups were not clearly defined; many ex-offenders were enrolled in more than one educational program. This made determination of group membership of ex-offenders difficult and in some cases judgmental on the part of the evaluation staff. The lack of clearly defined groups may have clouded the effects of any single education program group in terms of both employment and social adjustment. Another confounding factor in determining education program group membership concerned ex-offenders who had been enrolled in state correctional institution programs while serving sentences for previous convictions, but had not enrolled in any program during their current conviction. For the purpose of this study, they were classified in the no enrollment control group, although it could be asserted that they should be included in one of the education program groups. All three factors may have interacted with variables of primary concern to this study so as to somewhat confound post-release results. Future investigations will most certainly need to address these issues.

A Consideration of Goals

Educational program impacts have been investigated only in terms of post-release employment and social adjustment. It may be that these measures are not in concert with the goals and focus of current correctional education programs. The ABE/GED and Post-Secondary programs are aimed more at self-development and personal growth than at preparing the ex-offender for employment upon release. Although Vocational Education programs strive to provide ex-offenders with job-related skills, ex-offenders are frequently unable to find training-related employment upon their release. None of these programs specifically address issues related to social adjustment of ex-offenders upon release. This suggests that the goals of state correctional institution education programs need to be re-examined. If the goals of these programs are indeed directed at facilitating the post-release employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders, current programs need to be revised and expanded to reflect this focus. For example, programs on job hunting techniques, consumer skills and financial management could be added to assist ex-offenders in their transition to the outside world. Additionally, in the vocational area, programs should emphasize courses which provide the offender with all the necessary skills as well as credentials needed for immediate employability upon release. This would include any necessary certification that may be required to practice a skill or trade.

If the goals of correctional education programs are determined to be more short-ranged and directed at providing educational growth and self-

development opportunities instead, evaluation procedures should be revised to reflect actual education program goals.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of state correctional education programs is dependent upon the clear delineation of program goals and the development of appropriate measures to assess program effects in goal areas.

In view of the findings of the present study, it is imperative that consideration be given to the following recommendations:

1. That a restructuring of present ABE/GED, Vocational and Post-Secondary Programs be undertaken to make them more relevant to long-term goals associated with post-release employment and social adjustment.
2. That ABE/GED Programs, in particular, provide for more practical and consumer-oriented courses in addition to current offerings.
3. That Vocational Programs, in particular, provide training of sufficient quality and in areas with sufficient employment openings such that immediate employment in those areas is possible for a substantial number of participants upon their release.
4. That correctional education programs provide for some type of involvement of inmates with short sentences or relatively short periods of time to release, particularly in the ABE/GED area.

5. That involvement of both inmates and ex-offenders be solicited and utilized in re-shaping correctional education programs to make them more relevant to long-term goals and participant needs.

6. That some type of systematic advertising or other promotional approach be initiated in orienting inmates to education program offerings and in motivating inmates to enroll and attend education programs.

APPENDIX A

PRE-RELEASE INSTRUMENTATION

INSTITUTIONAL RECORD FORM

Name_____ I.D.#_____

From JBC-47A:

1. Ethnicity: (A) Caucasian (B) Black (C) Spanish (D) Other

2. Educational Level (highest grade completed):_____

3. Current Offense:_____

4. Length of Current Sentence: Max: Min:_____

5. Years Served on Current Sentence:_____

6. Beta Score: Test Date:_____ I.Q.:_____

7. Wrat Score: Test Date:_____ Battery Mean: SS____GE____

   Reading: SS____GE____SPELLING: SS____GE____ARITH: SS____GE____

8. Job at Time of Admission:_____ Dot Code:_____ Months:_____

9. Other Prior Work Experience:_____ Dot Code:_____ Months:____

   _____ Dot Code:_____ Months:____

From JBC-14

10. Number of Prison Offenses _____

11. Number of Fighting Incidences _____

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

12. Institutional Education & Training

Level of Instr.	Subject Course-Cluster	USOE Code	Date	TTL Hrs. Credit	Evaluation

13. Institutional Work & Training Assignment

Agency	Work Assignment	Dot Code	Date	Total Wks. Work	Evaluation/Grade

Name: _____ I.D. #: _____

PERSONAL INTERVIEW FORM

Personal History

Background Characteristics

1. Age at time of scheduled release: _____
2. Place of Birth: _____
3. Religion: _____
4. Marital status
   (A) Married and living with wife
   (B) Single
   (C) Separated/divorced
5. Educational level (highest grade completed): _____
6. Current offense: _____
7. Length of current sentence: _____
8. Years served on current sentence: _____
9. Age at first conviction: _____
10. Number of prior convictions as an adult: _____
11. Number of prior admissions to adult institutions: _____
12. Number of prior admissions to juvenile institutions: _____
13. With whom living during childhood
    (A) Both parents
    (B) Single parent
    (C) Adopted, fostered, or institutions

14. Family involvement in crime

    (A) Yes

    (B) No

15. Alcohol use

    (A) Heavy drinker

    (B) Drink occassionally

    (C) Don't drink

16. Drug use (other than Marajuana)

    (A) Had never taken drugs

    (B) Was regular drug user

Pre-Release Employment

Pre-Institutional Employment

1. Nature of job at time of last offense:_____

2. Skill level of job at time of last offense:_____

3. How long was job held at time of last offense:_____

4. Weekly wage or salary of job at time of last offense:_____

5. Longest period in any one job:_____

6. Largest weekly wage or salary earned at any one job:_____

7. Number of jobs held during 2 year period before last offense:
   _____

8. Frequency of job separations during two year period before last offense:_____

9. Reasons for any job separations during two years preceding last offense:_____

PRE-RELEASE QUESTIONNAIRE

SOCAD

Instructions

1. Read each item on the questionnaire carefully.

2. Choose the response which best fits the item.

3. Record the letter of that response opposite the appropriate item number on the answer sheet provided.

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

1. Have you developed any strong friendships with other inmates while you have been in prison?

(A) No
(B) Yes, 1 or 2
(C) Yes, a few (3 to 5)
(D) Yes, several (more than 5)

2. Think back over the time that you have spent in this prison. How would you say that you spent most of your free time?

(A) Mostly by myself
(B) With several different inmates, but not in any one group
(C) With 1 or 2 inmates
(D) Mostly with a group of inmates who are together quite a lot

3. How much time do you spend talking with prison employees?

(A) A great deal
(B) A fair amount
(C) Very little
(D) None

4. The extent to which I am worried about finding employment after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

5. The extent to which I am worried about my family after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

6. The extent to which I am worried about eating regular meals after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

7. The extent to which I am worried about going back to prison after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

8. The extent to which I am worried about finding a place to stay after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

9. The extent to which I am worried about managing financially after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

10. The extent to which I am worried about my self-identity after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

11. The extent to which I am worried about my acceptance after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

12. The extent to which I am worried about keeping employment after release:

(A) Most worried about
(B) More worried about
(C) Less worried about
(D) Least worried about

13. The situations which led to the offense for which I was committed still exist on the outside:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

14. Would you say that you have more contacts with treatment staff people (parole officers, associate warden treatment psychologists, chaplins, etc.) than the average inmate has or less?

(A) Much more than average
(B) A little more than average
(C) A little less than average
(D) Much less than average

15. Visits by my family and friends while in prison occurred very frequently:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

16. While in prison I received letters from my family and friends very frequently:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

17. Spending my first night away from prison with people I care about means a lot to me:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

18. I would tell my personal business:

(A) Only to my close friends
(B) Only to inmates that I know well
(C) To any inmate
(D) To no one

19. I would let myself be punished by prison officials for something I didn't do:

(A) Only to protect a close friend
(B) To protect inmates that I know well
(C) To protect any inmate at all
(D) Never

20. When I'm released I would be willing to invite into my home:

(A) Only those inmates that are my close friends
(B) Only those inmates that I know well
(C) Any inmate
(D) No one who has done time

21. When I get out I don't want to associate with the kind of people that are always getting into trouble:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

22. I want to keep in touch with inmates I met here after I get out:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

23. The people that I usually prefer as friends do not have much respect for the law:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

24. A man should always obey the laws, no matter how much they stand in the way of his ambitions:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

25. It is difficult to break the law and keep one's self-respect:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

26. It's alright to "get around" the law if you do not actually break it:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

27. A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

28. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life that I have:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

29. I don't have much in common with people who never broke the law:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

30. Who you know is more important than what you know, and brains are more important than brawn:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

31. "Might is right" and "every man for himself" are the main rules for living, regardless of what people say:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

32. You have to take care of yourself because nobody else is going to take care of you:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

33. It makes me sore to have people tell me what to do:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

34. The only criminals I really know are the ones here in the prison:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

35. Most people really try to be law-abiding and truthful:

(A) Strongly agree
(B) Agree
(C) Disagree
(D) Strongly disagree

INSTITUTIONAL WORK ADJUSTMENT SCALE

(Work Supervisor Ratings)

IWAS

Instructions

For Work Supervisors only:

1. Complete one STANDARD ANSWER SHEET (DS 1120-A) for each inmate you supervise.

2. Where it says "SCHOOL" on the answer sheet, print the name of the correctional institution.

3. Where it says "INSTRUCTOR" on the answer sheet, print your own name.

4. Where it says "YOUR LAST NAME," "YOUR FIRST NAME," and "MI," print the last name, first name and middle initial of the inmate you are rating. Print only one letter to a box. If the name is too large to fit in the spaces provided, print as many letters as you can and omit rest.

5. Rate each inmate you supervise on work adjustment according to each of the items on this scale. Decide for each item on the scale whether the statement is true of the inmate: always, usually, sometimes, or never. Then record your responses on the answer sheet by marking the appropriate letter opposite each item number.

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

INSTITUTIONAL WORK ADJUSTMENT SCALE

(Work Supervisor Ratings)

	A	B	C	D
	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
A. Work Quality				
1. The quality of inmate's work is high.				
2. The speed of inmate's work is high.				
3. Inmate's job skills are adequate for tasks assigned.				
4. Inmate doesn't seem to learn from the mistakes he makes.				
5. Even after being corrected the inmate seems to persist in doing a task his own way.				
6. Inmate begins work immediately upon arrival, and continues until told to stop.				
B. Work Interest and Satisfaction				
7. Inmate asks about the salary scale of his work in the community.				
8. Inmate asks for reading references relative to the training program.				
9. Inmate mentions to his supervisor that he likes his work.				
C. Work Leadership				
10. When a task is assigned to a group of inmates it is this inmate who takes charge.				

	A	B	C	D
C. Work Leadership (continued)	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
11. Supervisor finds himself using this inmate as his "assistant."				
12. Inmate shows another inmate how to do something only when specifically instructed to do so.				
13. Inmate has trouble getting along with co-workers in work situations.				
D. Work Dependency				
14. Inmate comes to the supervisor to seek help with each new phase of the task.				
15. Inmate seeks advice with personal problems from the supervisor.				
16. Inmate rarely, if ever, asks the supervisor for additional work.				

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
1700 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103

PERMISSION FOR RELEASE OF INFORMATION

I hereby grant permission for representatives of Research for Better Schools, Inc. to access and/or reproduce information from Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Justice Bureau of Correction form: JBC-47A Education and Training Cumulative Record. I also grant permission for representatives of Research for Better Schools, Inc. to obtain evaluations of my work from my work supervisor. No pressure has been placed upon me to offer this informed consent. I intend to be legally bound by this waiver.

_____ _____

Witness Signature

_____

Date

APPENDIX B

POST-RELEASE INSTRUMENTATION

POST-RELEASE INTERVIEW

Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions - A Follow-Up Study of Ex-Offenders

Research for Better Schools
Division of Planning and Evaluation
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

POST-RELEASE INTERVIEW

This interview is divided into six sections. There are separate directions for each section; be sure to read these to ex-offenders before you start each section.

Interview Procedure

1. Place telephone call to ex-offender based on information from the Follow-Up Information Sheet and parole agent.
2. Introduce yourself to ex-offender.
3. Review purpose of interview and answer any questions of ex-offender.
4. Review confidentiality of information. Also indicate that ex-offender may decline to answer any question.
5. Proceed through interview form and be sure to read directions to ex-offender before starting each section.
6. If ex-offender is working full-time, ask for permission to contact employer. If consents, send appropriate packet to ex-offender.
7. After completing interview, thank ex-offender for assistance.

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

SECTION I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Complete the following items before proceeding with actual interview. Some information may be obtained from Follow-Up Information Sheet and simply checked with ex-offender.

Name: _____

Address: _____
(Street Address)

_____
City, State, Zip

Released from: _____ _____
SCI

on: _____
Date

	successful	unsuccessful (suggestions for next attempt)
Contact #1:	_____	_____
#2:	_____	_____
#3:	_____	_____

Marital Status: Married _____
Single _____
Separated/Divorced _____

SECTION II: EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE SCALE

Directions: Read the following directions to ex-offender. Be sure that he/she understands each question. If his/her response is unclear, ask appropriate clarifications questions.

> I would like to ask you some questions about your present job situation. If you do not understand a particular question, just tell me and I will try to explain it to you. If you don't want to answer a question, just tell me and we will go to the next question.

1. Are you working full-time now?

_____ Yes If yes, where? _____
Employer Name

_____ No

_____
Street Address

_____
City, State, Zip Code

If yes, skip to item #7. If no, continue with item #2.

2. Are you working part-time now?

_____ Yes If yes, where? _____
Employer Name

_____ No

_____
Street Address

_____
City, State, Zip Code

3. Are you now attending school?

_____ Yes If yes, where? _____
School

_____ No

_____
City, State, Zip Code

4. Are you now involved in a drug or other type of rehabilitation program?

_____ Yes If yes, where? _____
Program

_____ No

_____
Type of Program

_____
City, State, Zip Code

5. Are you now looking for full-time work?

_____ No

_____ Yes If yes, how are you looking for work? (Check all that apply?)

_____ newspaper ads
_____ friends/relatives
_____ Prisoner's Aid Society
_____ State Employment Service
_____ filing applications with employers
_____ employment agency
_____ SCI Job Placement Officer
_____ parole office
_____ school placement service
_____ labor union
_____ Salvation Army
_____ past employer
_____ other (specify) _____
_____

5a. How often do you look for work?

_____ Everyday

_____ 2-3 times a week

_____ once a week

_____ other (specify) _____

5b. Have you had any employment interviews?

_____ yes, how many? _____

_____ no

5c. Have you refused employment?

_____ no

_____ yes, why? _____
# of times _____

6. In what field are you looking for work? (check preference)

_____ carpentry and related	_____ janitorial
_____ factory	_____ sales
_____ machine and related	_____ food services
_____ cab/truck driving	_____ other (specify) _____
	_____

Now skip to item #13.

7. What type of work do you do there? (describe briefly and check one category) _____

_____

_____ carpentry and related	_____ janitorial
_____ factory	_____ sales
_____ machine and related	_____ food services
_____ cab/truck driving	_____ other (specify) _____
	_____

8. If you had your choice, is this what you would really like to be doing or would you rather be doing something else?

_____ No

_____ Yes If yes, what would that be? (check one)

_____ carpentry and related	_____ janitorial
_____ factory	_____ sales
_____ machine and related	_____ food services
_____ cab/truck driving	_____ other (specify) _____
	_____

9. How long have you been working there? _____ _____ weeks

10. What is your weekly wage or salary? $ _____
gross

11. About how many days have you missed work since you started working there? _____ days

12. How did you find this job? (check all that ex-offender indicates, may give examples)

_____ newspaper ads
_____ friends/relatives
_____ Prisoner's Aid Society
_____ State employment service
_____ filing applications with employers
_____ employment agency
_____ SCI Job Placement Officer
_____ parole office
_____ school placement service
_____ labor union
_____ Salvation Army
_____ past employer
_____ other (specify) _____
_____

13. Have you had any other jobs since your release?

_____ No If no, skip to item 14.

_____ Yes If yes, complete information below.

Job Description	Length of Employment	Weekly Salary (gross)	Reason for Leaving
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

14. Did you have a job as part of your parole plan?

_____ No (skip to Item 15)

_____ Yes, where? _____

a. Was job available upon your release?

_____ Yes

_____ No, why not? _____

15. Were you turned down for a job since your release?

_____ Yes # of times _____

_____ No (skip to Item #17)

16. Why were you turned down for employment? (check all that apply)

_____ not turned down
_____ criminal record
_____ unqualified (skills, education)
_____ no openings
_____ age
_____ sex
_____ no prior experience in field
_____ health
_____ poor work references
_____ no work history
_____ other (specify)_____
_____

17. Are you eligible for veterans benefits? (served more than 181 active days of duty)

_____ No

_____ Yes If yes are you using the GI Bill to pay for any education or training program now?

_____ No, why _____

_____

_____ Yes, specify program _____

_____

If ex-offender has worked for at least 1 month full-time, ask questions in Section III; otherwise proceed to Section IV.

SECTION III: EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Directions: Read the following directions to ex-offender. Be sure that he/she understands each question. If his/her response is unclear, ask appropriate clarification questions. There is space provided for notes for each sub-section; nevertheless, be sure to rate ex-offender on each item.

> Let's talk some more about your full-time job at _____. When you answer the next set of questions, think about your experiences at this job only. As before, if you do not understand a question, just tell me and I'll try to explain it.

A. Job Satisfaction

1. Are you satisfied with this job? Why or why not?

_____ very dissatisfied _____ dissatisfied _____ satisfied _____ very satisfied

2. Do you look forward to going to work everyday?

_____ strongly dislikes _____ dislikes _____ likes _____ strongly likes

3. Are you paid enough for your particular job?

_____ greatly underpaid _____ somewhat underpaid _____ adequately paid _____ generously paid

B. Relationship with Supervisors

4. How well do you get along with your supervisor(s) at work?

_____ rarely gets along with supervisor	_____ sometimes gets along with supervisor	_____ frequently gets along with supervisor	_____ almost always gets along with supervisor

5. If you are unsure or having trouble with a particular job, can you ask your supervisor to help you?

_____ rarely asks for help	_____ sometimes asks for help	_____ frequently asks for help	_____ almost always asks for help

6. Can you discuss personal problems with your supervisor?

_____ rarely	_____ sometimes	_____ frequently	_____ almost always

C. Relationship with Co-Workers

7. Can you discuss personal problems with your co-workers?

_____ gets along with no people at work	_____ gets along with few people at work	_____ gets along with some people at work	_____ gets along with most people at work

8. Do you associate with co-workers after work?

_____ rarely _____ sometimes _____ frequently _____ almost always

D. Productivity

9. How much work are you responsible for on your job?

_____ small amount of work _____ moderate amount of work _____ large amount of work

10. Do you have difficulty keeping up with your assigned work?

_____ almost always _____ frequently _____ sometimes _____ rarely

11. Do you receive compliments about your work?

_____ rarely _____ sometimes _____ frequently _____ almost always

12. Do you think anyone else could do your job as well as you do?

_____ definitely yes _____ possibly _____ doubtful _____ definitely not

E. Job Attitude

13. Do you like the kind of work you're now doing?

_____ strongly dislikes _____ dislikes _____ likes _____ strongly likes

14. If it wasn't for parole requirements would you keep this job?

_____ would not keep job _____ unsure _____ would keep job

15. Are you reminded of being an ex-offender at work?

_____ almost always _____ frequently _____ sometimes _____ rarely

F. Self-Improvement

16. Is this job good work experience for you?

_____ strongly disagree _____ disagree _____ agree _____ strongly agree

17. Have you learned new things or developed new skills at this job?

_____ has not learned anything _____ has learned a few new things _____ has learned some new things _____ has learned a lot of new things

18. Are there other jobs at work that you would like to have?

_____ none _____ few _____ some _____ very many

19. Are you looking for a better job now?

_____ Not looking at all _____ On the look-out, but not actively looking _____ Looking somewhat actively _____ Looking very actively

Proceed to Section IV: Post-Release Social Adjustment Scale

SECTION IV: POST-RELEASE SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Directions: Read the following directions to ex-offender. Be sure that he/she understands each question. If his/her response is unclear, ask appropriate clarification questions. For each area, the ex-offender will indicate if he/she has experienced problems in that area. If he/she acknowledges problems, then ask ex-offender to describe each problem briefly. Topics to be covered are included in parentheses. These descriptions should be noted in the space provided.

The next set of items deal with other aspects of your life besides work, such as living arrangements or relationships with your family and friends. I thought it might be helpful to discuss these other areas with you in order to understand your situation more completely. As before, you may decline to answer any question.

A lot of people upon release from prison have difficulty in certain areas (i.e., conflict with families or hassles with old friends about being in prison). For each area, tell me whether:

(1) you've had no problem in this area

(2) you've had minor problems in this area

(3) you've had major problems in this area

If you had problems, then describe briefly the kinds of problems you've had. Any questions?

	No Problem	Minor Problem	Major Problem
1. Housing/Living Arrangements Description (type, rent, location, privacy):	_____	_____	_____
2. Employment Description (finding employment, type of work, salary):	_____	_____	_____
3. Handling Money/Managing Financially Description (sufficient money to live on, extra money for spending on non-essentials):	_____	_____	_____
4. Conflict with Neighbors Description (about what, how resolved):	_____	_____	_____

	No Problem	Minor Problem	Major Problem
5. Relationship with Old Friends Description (maintain contacts, changes in relationships):	_____	_____	_____
6. Conflict with Relatives Description (with whom, about what, how resolved):	_____	_____	_____
7. Family Support Description (type of help or support, from whom, reasons for non-support):	_____	_____	_____
8. Stress Description (anxiety, depression, irritability, specific problem):	_____	_____	_____

	No Problem	Minor Problem	Major Problem
9. Hassles about Criminal Record Description (from whom, how resolved):	_____	_____	_____
10. Aggression, Arguments, Fighting Description (with whom, about what, how resolved):	_____	_____	_____
11. Alcohol Description (use, desire to stop, rehab program):	_____	_____	_____
12. Drugs Description (use, desire to stop, rehab program):	_____	_____	_____

	No Problem	Minor Problem	Major Problem
13. Disappointment About Things Not Going as Well as Expected Description (describe expectations, how not met):	_____	_____	_____

SECTION V: COMMENTS ABOUT PRISON PROGRAMS

Directions: Read the following directions to ex-offender. Encourage him/her to be honest and frank about comments.

> The last section deals with your comments about prison educational/vocational programs. Your constructive comments can help to make programs better, so that these programs provide services which will help inmates when they're released. All of your comments will be kept confidential.

1. Did you participate in educational/vocational programs before your release?

_____ Yes Which programs? (Check all that apply)

_____ No (Skip to Item #3)

_____ ABE
_____ GED
_____ Vocational
_____ Post-secondary

2. Why did you decide to participate in prison programs? (Skip to Item 4)

_____

_____

_____

_____ improve chance for parole
_____ improve job-related skills
_____ something to do in free time
_____ improve basic skills
_____ self-improvement
_____ peer pressure
_____ other (specify) _____

3. Why did you decide not to participate in prison programs? (Skip to Item 5)

_____

_____

_____

_____ not interested in pursuing education

_____ classes full

_____ coursework not offered in subject areas of interest

_____ course level too difficult

_____ course level too easy

_____ peer pressure

_____ program out-of-date

_____ Education Department never responded to inquiry

_____ instructional quality poor

_____ vocational courses offered in unrealistic job skills

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

4. Have these programs been helpful to you?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Why or why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What types of educational/vocational programs should be offered which would help in the area of employment?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If ex-offender is working full-time for at least one month, proceed to Section VI: EMPLOYER CONSENT. Otherwise, ask next item.

6. Have you violated your parole or been arrested since your release?

_____ No

_____ Yes _____ # of parole violations

_____ # of arrests

Then conclude interview by thanking ex-offender for his/her assistance.

SECTION VI: EMPLOYER CONSENT

Directions: Read the following directions to ex-offender, only if ex-offender has been working full-time for 1 month. Answer any questions ex-offender has after reading directions.

> In order to obtain some information about your current working habits, I would like to have your employer complete a short evaluation form. It would be sent to you, and then you could explain it to your employer. Obviously it is your decision - no contact will be made without your consent. The evaluation form will ask about your work habits and job attitude. Do I have your permission to do this?

_____ No

_____ Yes

If yes, send packet to ex-offender

Next, complete last item (#5) on previous page and conclude interview by thanking ex-offender for his/her assistance.

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

August 15, 1977

Dear Employer,

Your employee is participating in a follow-up study of ex-offenders conducted by Research for Better Schools. This study is sponsored by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and Bureau of Corrections. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the impacts of state correctional institution educational programs on the post-release employment of ex-offenders. Your employee has given consent for you to evaluate his/her work habits as part of this study. Your evaluation will be kept confidential.

It is important that you complete this work evaluation form as soon as possible. You may return your completed evaluation directly to us in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or Russ Dusewicz. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:cc

Encl.

Employee: _____ Date _____

Employer: _____

Employer Address: _____
(Street)

_____
(City, State, Zip Code)

Directions: Please indicate your satisfaction with the employee as compared with other workers in the same work group. If the worker is the only person employed with your firm, compare him with others who have worked in the same position. This information will be kept strictly confidential. Please respond to all questions.

I. Total number of months employee has been employed by your firm _____ mos.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY PLACING AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE SQUARE

II. In comparison with other workers in the same work group, how would you rate the employee on each of the following characteristics?

	above average	about average	below average
1. The quality of employee's work	[1]	[2]	[3]
2. The quantity of employee's work	[1]	[2]	[3]
3. The degree to which the employee possesses specific job-related knowledge important to success	[1]	[2]	[3]
4. Willingness to accept responsibility	[1]	[2]	[3]
5. Punctuality	[1]	[2]	[3]
6. Ability to work without supervision	[1]	[2]	[3]
7. Willingness to learn and improve	[1]	[2]	[3]
8. Rapport with co-workers	[1]	[2]	[3]
9. Cooperation with supervisor	[1]	[2]	[3]
10. Compliance with company policies, rules, and practices	[1]	[2]	[3]
11. Work attendance	[1]	[2]	[3]

III. In comparison with other workers in the same work group, how would you rate the employee's overall competency, effectiveness, proficiency, general overall work attitudes, and other elements of successful job performance?

[1] in the top 1/4

[2] in the top 1/2 but not among the top 1/4

[3] in the bottom 1/2 but not among the lowest 1/4

[4] in the lowest 1/4

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP COMMUNICATIONS

LETTERS TO PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICES

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

May 31, 1977

Research for Better Schools (RBS) is currently conducting a study for the Pennsylvania Department of Education, entitled "Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow-up Study of Ex-offenders." This study focuses in particular on post-release employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders who participated in educational/vocational programs while in prison. A comparison group of inmates who did not participate in educational/vocational programs was also included. All inmates eligible for parole during February and March, regardless of educational/vocational program involvement, were interviewed before their scheduled release from prison regarding past employment, criminal records, social adjustment and educational history. Approximately 100 of these inmates were in fact released. It is important that ex-offenders are interviewed again in July so that information is obtained about their post-release experiences. At that time, ex-offenders will be asked about post-release employment and social adjustment. They will also be provided with the opportunity to comment on educational programs that existed during their incarceration. As with pre-release interviews, ex-offenders may refuse to answer any question they find objectionable. All information is kept confidential.

In contacting Hermann Tartler, Board of Probation and Parole Secretary, RBS was provided with parole agents assigned to each of the sample ex-offenders. Your name was included on that list. During pre-release interviews, RBS obtained whenever possible addresses and telephone numbers for use in contacting ex-offenders. In many cases, these were only the inmate's best guess. Consequently, for each ex-offender listed on the following page, would you indicate his/her current address and telephone number. If any of these ex-offenders are no longer assigned to you, would you also please note this and if known, the currently-assigned parole agent.

Post-release telephone interviews are tentatively scheduled for the month of July. Other arrangements may be made for ex-offenders we are unable to reach by telephone. At this point, we are trying to re-establish contact with ex-offenders in preparation for these interviews. Each ex-offender will receive in the mail a short review of his/her participation prior to release and a follow-up fact sheet to complete and return to RBS. This sheet asks for information about contacting him/her in July.

It is important that this contact be completed very soon. I hope that you will be able to provide us with the requested information as soon as possible. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me or Russ Dusewicz.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:db

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

July 28, 1977

Dear

Research for Better Schools (RBS) is currently conducting a study for the Pennsylvania Department of Education, entitled "Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow Up Study of Ex-Offenders." This study focuses in particular on post-release employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders who participated in educational/vocational programs while in prison. A comparison group of inmates who did not participate in educational/vocational programs was also included. All inmates eligible for parole during February and March, regardless of educational/vocational program involvement, were interviewed before their scheduled release from prison regarding past employment, criminal record, social adjustment, and educational history. Approximately 100 of these inmates were in fact released. It is important that ex-offenders are interviewed again in August so that information is obtained about their post-release experiences. At that time, ex-offenders will be asked about post-release employment and social adjustment. They will also be provided with the opportunity to comment on educational programs that existed during their incarceration. As with pre-release interviews, ex-offenders may refuse to answer any question they find objectionable. All information is kept confidential.

In contacting Hermann Tartler, Board of Probation and Parole Secretary, RBS was provided with probation offices assigned to the sample's ex-offenders. Your office was included on that list. During pre-release interviews, RBS obtained whenever possible addresses and telephone numbers for use in contacting ex-offenders. In many cases, these were only the inmate's best guess. Consequently for each ex-offender listed on the following page, would you indicate his/her current address and telephone number. If any of these ex-offenders are no longer assigned to your office, would you also please note this, and if known, the currently-assigned probation office.

Post-release telephone interviews are scheduled for August. Other arrangements may be made for ex-offenders we are unable to reach by telephone. At this point, we are trying to re-establish contact with ex-offenders in preparation for these interviews. Each ex-offender will receive in the mail a short review of his/her participation prior to release and a follow-up sheet to complete and return to RBS. This sheet asks for information about contacting him/her in August.

It is important that this contact be completed very soon. I hope that you will be able to provide us with the requested information as soon as possible. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me or Russ Dusewicz.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:cc

LETTERS TO EX-OFFENDERS

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

June 23, 1977

- Did you participate in educational/vocational programs before your release from prison?

- Have prison educational/vocational programs been helpful to you in obtaining employment?

- Why did you choose to participate or not to participate in prison educational/vocational programs?

- What types of educational/vocational programs would help you and other ex-cons find jobs?

The Department of Education and the Bureau of Corrections is trying to answer the above questions. In order to do that, they need your help. You can provide important information about your prison educational/vocational and work experiences. Your response can help make prison programs better for other inmates.

Before your release, you were interviewed by RBS and provided important information about your past work experiences. In July or August, we will contact you by telephone or mail and ask you questions about your recent work experiences. You will also be asked for comments and suggestions on prison educational/vocational programs. As before, you may refuse to answer any question. All information will be kept confidential.

In order to contact you more easily in July or August, please complete the enclosed Follow-Up Information Sheet. You can return it to us in the provided return envelope. As we hope to contact you very soon, it is important that you return the information sheet promptly.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:cc

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION SHEET

DIRECTIONS: Complete the items below. Please print clearly the required information. All responses will be kept confidential.

Name: _____

Address you can be reached in July: _____
(Street Address)

_____
(City, State, Zip Code)

Phone Number you can be reached in July: ( ) - _____
Area Code

Best time of day to reach you: _____

Are you now employed? _____

If yes, by whom: _____
(Employer's Name)

Are you satisfied with this job? (Check one)

___very dissatisfied ___dissatisfied ___satisfied ___very satisfied

Other Comments:

Place in provided self-addressed stamped envelope and mail to RBS

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

August 12, 1977

- Did you participate in educational/vocational programs before your release from prison?

- Have prison educational/vocational programs been helpful to you in obtaining employment?

- Why did you choose to participate or not to participate in prison educational/vocational programs?

- What types of educational/vocational programs would help you and other ex-cons find jobs?

The Department of Education and the Bureau of Corrections is trying to answer the above questions. In order to do that, they need your help. You can provide important information about your prison educational/vocational and work experiences. Your response can help make prison programs better for other inmates.

Before your release, you were interviewed by RBS and provided important information about your past work experiences. We would now like to talk to you about your experiences since release. You will also be asked for comments and suggestions on prison educational/vocational programs. As before, you may refuse to answer any question. All information will be kept confidential.

According to our records, you do not have a telephone listed in your name. We would therefore appreciate it if you would call either me or Russ Dusewicz at (215) 561-4100, ext. 228 or 290. Please call us collect if it is a long distance phone call.

It is important that we talk to you before the end of August. Hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Buttram

Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:cc

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION SHEET

DIRECTIONS: Complete the items below. Please print clearly the required information. All responses will be kept confidential.

Name: _____

Address you can be reached in July: _____
(Street Address)

_____
(City, State, Zip Code)

Phone Number you can be reached in July: (___) - _____
Area Code

Best time of day to reach you: _____

Are you now employed? _____

If yes, by whom: _____
(Employer's Name)

Are you satisfied with this job? (Check one)

___very dissatisfied ___dissatisfied ___satisfied ___very satisfied

Other Comments:

Place in provided self-addressed stamped envelope and mail to RBS

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

August 26, 1977

Dear

Research for Better Schools (RBS) is currently conducting a study for the Pennsylvania Department of Education, entitled "Effectiveness of Educational Programs in State Correctional Institutions: A Follow-up Study of Ex-offenders." This study focuses in particular on post-release employment and social adjustment of ex-offenders who participated in educational/vocational programs while in prison but is also concerned with ex-offenders who did not participate in these programs.

In early June I contacted you about sample ex-offenders who were assigned to you. At that time, we were just beginning efforts to re-establish contact with them. I asked you to provide address and phone numbers for ex-offenders. In following up on information provided by you and others, we have not been able to contact the ex-offender. Consequently, I would appreciate it if you would verify the current address and phone number of ex-offenders listed on the following page. If my information is incorrect, would you please correct it?

As we are in the final stages of our follow-up efforts, I would appreciate your prompt response. If you do have appointments with any of these ex-offenders, I would also appreciate your encouragement of them to continue participating in the study by calling me at 215-561-4100 ext. 228. They may call collect if it is a long distance call.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

September 8, 1977

Dear

Research for Better Schools (RBS) is helping the Department of Education and Bureau of Corrections evaluate prison educational/vocational programs. In order to do that, we need your help. You can provide important information about your prison experiences. Your response can help make prison programs better for other inmates.

Before your release, you were interviewed by RBS and provided important information about your past work experiences. We would now like to talk to you about your experiences since release. You will also be asked for comments and suggestions on prison educational/vocational programs. As before, you may refuse to answer any question. All information will be kept confidential.

We have been unsuccessful in reaching you since the beginning of August. We would therefore appreciate it if you would call either me or Russ Dusewicz at (215) 561-4100, ext. 228 or 290. Please call us collect if it is a long distance phone call.

It is important that we talk to you in the next week. Hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:cc

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

Dear

During our recent phone conversation, we discussed the possibility of your current employer completing a short evaluation of your work habits. A copy of this evaluation form along with a short letter of explanation on the reverse side and return envelope are enclosed. Please give both to your employer to complete. This evaluation will be kept confidential. It is important that your employer return his/her evaluation of your work as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INCORPORATED SUITE 1700 / 1700 MARKET ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103 / 215 561-4100

August 15, 1977

Dear Employer,

Your employee is participating in a follow-up study of ex-offenders conducted by Research for Better Schools. This study is sponsored by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and Bureau of Corrections. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the impacts of state correctional institution educational programs on the post-release employment of ex-offenders. Your employee has given consent for you to evaluate his/her work habits as part of this study. Your evaluation will be kept confidential.

It is important that you complete this work evaluation form as soon as possible. You may return your completed evaluation directly to us in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or Russ Dusewicz. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Buttram
Evaluator

JLB:cc

Encl.

Employee: _____ Date _____

Employer: _____

Employer Address: _____
(Street)

_____
(City, State, Zip Code)

Directions: Please indicate your satisfaction with the employee as compared with other workers in the same work group. If the worker is the only person employed with your firm, compare him with others who have worked in the same position. This information will be kept strictly confidential. Please respond to all questions.

I. Total number of months employee has been employed by your firm _____ mos.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY PLACING AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE SQUARE

II. In comparison with other workers in the same work group, how would you rate the employee on each of the following characteristics?

	above average	about average	below average
1. The quality of employee's work	[1]	[2]	[3]
2. The quantity of employee's work	[1]	[2]	[3]
3. The degree to which the employee possesses specific job-related knowledge important to success	[1]	[2]	[3]
4. Willingness to accept responsibility	[1]	[2]	[3]
5. Punctuality	[1]	[2]	[3]
6. Ability to work without supervision	[1]	[2]	[3]
7. Willingness to learn and improve	[1]	[2]	[3]
8. Rapport with co-workers	[1]	[2]	[3]
9. Cooperation with supervisor	[1]	[2]	[3]
10. Compliance with company policies, rules, and practices	[1]	[2]	[3]
11. Work attendance	[1]	[2]	[3]

III. In comparison with other workers in the same work group, how would you rate the employee's overall competency, effectiveness, proficiency, general overall work attitudes, and other elements of successful job performance?

[1] in the top 1/4

[2] in the top 1/2 but not among the top 1/4

[3] in the bottom 1/2 but not among the lowest 1/4

[4] in the lowest 1/4